R

Presented to the Library

BY

Lady Shirley Murphy

Date August 26th 1929

b. fri.

Class Mark SQR Accession No. 12610

London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine
LIBRARY
19 JUNE 1930

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

https://archive.org/details/b21365908_001

Brought from the Lords, 7 August 1888.

FIRST REPORT

FROM THE

G.B.

SELECT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS

ON THE

SWEATING SYSTEM;

TOGETHER WITH THE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE,

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE,

AND APPENDIX.

Ordered, by the House of Commons, *to be Printed,*
11 *August* 1888.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY HENRY HANSARD AND SON;
AND
Published by EYRE and SPOTTISWOODE, East Harding-street, London, E.C.,
and 32, Abingdon-street, Westminster, S.W.;
ADAM and CHARLES BLACK, North Bridge, Edinburgh;
and HODGES, FIGGIS, and Co., 104, Grafton-street, Dublin.

361.

TROPICAL MEDICINE LIBRARY

12610

FIRST REPORT - - - - - - - - - - - p. iii

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE - - - - - - p. v

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE - - - - - - - - p. 1

APPENDIX - - - - - - - - - - - - p. 1021

FIRST REPORT.

BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE appointed to inquire into the SWEATING SYSTEM at the EAST END of LONDON, and to Report thereon to the HOUSE from time to time.

ORDERED TO REPORT,

THAT the Committee have met, and have considered the subject referred to them.

The Committee have examined Witnesses in the Boot and Shoe, Tailoring, Cabinet and Upholstering, and other trades, and agree that the Evidence although unfinished, may be reported, and the inquiry adjourned. The Committee desire to make the following remarks:—

1. In the opinion of your Committee, the evidence already taken sufficiently indicates the existence of grave evils, in connection with what is known as the Sweating System, in the localities to which their investigations have been confined. They have reason to believe that the same or similar evils prevail in other parts of the Metropolis as well as in other Towns and Cities, and affect various industries not yet examined. Their views in this respect are strengthened by many resolutions and applications received from societies and individuals praying for an extension of the inquiry. It also appears that many persons engaged in the trades under consideration carry on business in various districts in London and in the country also.

Solomon, 829. 876. Hoffman, 1109. Hayes, 1610. Liddle, 1675. Attewell, 1708. Lyons, 1790. Maple, 6058. Hollington, 9481, 9533. Moses, 8650. 9159. Craig, 9923. Flatau, 10051. 10129. Branch, 10249—50. Moses, 9000. Hollington, 9446. Flatau, 10132.

2. For these reasons an exhaustive inquiry is impossible under a reference limiting the area of investigation to the East End of London; and your Committee recommend such an extension of their reference as will enable them to prosecute their inquiries throughout the Metropolis and in such Cities and Towns or Rural Districts in the United Kingdom as they may select

And the Committee have directed the Minutes of Evidence taken before them up to the present time, together with an Appendix, to be laid before your Lordships.

30th July 1888.

ORDER OF REFERENCE.

Die Martis, 28° *Februarii*, 1888.

SWEATING SYSTEM.

Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the Sweating System at the East End of London, and to report thereon to the House; and that the witnesses before the said Select Committee be examined on oath (The Lord Kenry, *Earl Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).

After debate, agreed to.

Die Veneris, 9° *Martii*, 1888.

Select Committee on;

The Lords following were named of the Committee:

Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.
Earl Derby.
Earl Onslow.
Viscount Gordon (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord Clinton.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.
Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord Wigan (*Earl of Crawford and Balcarres*).
Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Rothschild.
Lord Monkswell.
Lord Thring.

The Committee to appoint their own Chairman.

Die Lunæ, 12° *Martii*, 1888.

Select Committee to meet To-morrow, at half-past Three o'clock.

Die Veneris, 23° *Martii*, 1888.

The evidence taken before the Select Committee from time to time to be printed for the use of the Members of this House; but no copies thereof to be delivered except to Members of the Committee, until further order.

Die Martis, 17° *Aprilis*, 1888.

Ordered, That the Select Committee have power to direct that copies of the evidence be delivered to such persons as they shall think fit.

Die Martis, 19° *Junii*, 1888.

Message to the Commons for leave for John Blundell Maple, Esq. (a Member), to attend the Select Committee.

Die Veneris, 22° *Junii*, 1888.

Message from the Commons giving leave for John Blundell Maple, Esq. (a Member), to attend the Select Committee (pursuant to Message of Tuesday last).

Die Martis, 3° *Julii*, 1888.

Message to the Commons for leave for Samuel Montagu, Esq. (a Member), to attend the Select Committee.

Die Jovis, 5° *Julii*, 1888.

Message from the Commons giving leave to Samuel Montagu, Esq. (a Member), to attend the Select Committee (pursuant to Message of Tuesday last).

Die Lunæ, 30° *Julii*, 1888.

Leave given to the Select Committee to report from time to time.

ORDS PRESENT, AND MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AT EACH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE.

Die Martis, 13° *Martii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.
Earl of Onslow.
Viscount Gordon (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.
Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord Wigan (*Earl of Crawford and Balcarres*).
Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Rothschild.
Lord Monkswell.
Lord Thring.

Order of Reference read.

It is moved, That the Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) do take the Chair.

The same is agreed to.

The course of Proceeding is considered.

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Veneris, 16° *Martii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.
Earl of Onslow.
Lord Clinton.
Lord Clifford Chudleigh.
Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Wigan (*Earl of Crawford and Balcarres*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Monkswell.
Lord Thring.

The LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Tuesday last are read.

The course of Proceeding is further considered.

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Veneris, 23° *Martii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.
Earl of Derby.
Earl of Onslow.
Viscount Gordon (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord Clinton.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.
Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Rothschild.
Lord Monkswell.
Lord Thring.

The LORD KENRY (*The Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Friday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and having been sworn, are examined, viz.:—Mr. *Morris Stephany* and Mr. *Charles Booth* (*vide* the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Friday the 13th of April next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Veneris, 13° *Aprilis*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.
Earl of Derby.
Earl of Onslow.
Lord Clinton.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.
Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Rothschild.
Lord Thring.

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Friday, the 23rd of March last, are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and, having been sworn, are examined, viz.:—Mr. *Arnold Henry White*, *Samuel Wildman*, *Meyer Feilweil*, and *Solomon Hirsch* (*vide* the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Martis, 17° *Aprilis*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.
Earl of Onslow.
Lord Clinton.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.
Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Thring.

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Friday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and, having been sworn, are examined, viz.:—*Samuel Wildman*, *Charles Solomon*, *Solomon Rosenberg*, *Solomon Baum*, and Mr. *William Hoffman*.

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Veneris, 20° *Aprilis*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of Onslow.
Viscount Gordon (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord Clinton.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.
Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord Kenry (*Earl of Duraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Rothschild.
Lord Monkswell.
Lord Thring.

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Tuesday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and, having been sworn, are examined, viz.:—Mr. *William Hoffman* (further examined), Mr. *Arnold Henry White* (further examined), and the Reverend *James Munro* (*vide* the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Martis, 24° *Aprilis*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of Derby.
Earl of Onslow.
Viscount Gordon (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord Clinton.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.
Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord Wigan (*Earl of Crawford and Balcarres*).
Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Rothschild.
Lord Monkswell.
Lord Thring.

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Friday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and, having been sworn, are examined, viz.:—The Rev. *James Munro* (further examined), Mr. *William Hawes*, Mrs. *Isabella Killick*, Mrs. *Mary Hayes*, Mrs. *Lavinia Casey*, Mrs. *Frances Amelia Liddle*, Mrs. *Susan Attewell*, Mrs. *Eliza Glazier*, and Mr. *Lewis Lyons* (*vide* the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Veneris, 27° *Aprilis*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of Derby.
Earl of Onslow.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.
Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Monkswell.
Lord Thring.

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Tuesday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and, having been sworn, are examined, viz.:—Mr. *Arnold Henry White* (further examined), Mr. *Lewis Lyons* (further examined), and Mr. *Solomon Plattman* (*vide* the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Martis, 1° *Maii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.
Earl of Derby.
Earl of Onslow.
Viscount Gordon (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord Clinton.
Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Rothschild.
Lord Monkswell.
Lord Thring.

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Friday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and, having been sworn, are examined, viz.:—Mr. *Arnold Henry White* (further examined), *Henry Miller*, and *Joseph Matthew Tisshaw* (*vide* the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Veneris, 4° *Maii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.
Earl of Derby.
Earl of Onslow.
Lord Clinton.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.
Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Monkswell.
Lord Thring.

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Tuesday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and, having been sworn, are examined, viz.:—Rev. *William Adamson*, *Woolf Silverman*, *Isaac Levy*, *Barnett Cohen*, and *Fanny Eisenberger* (*vide* the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Martis, 8° *Maii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.
Earl of Derby.
Earl of Onslow.
Viscount Gordon (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord Clinton.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.
Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Rothschild.
Lord Monkswell.
Lord Thring.

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Friday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and, having been sworn, are examined, viz.:—Mr. *William Parnell*, Mr. *Frederick Charles Baum*, *Henry Miller*, and Mr. *Thomas Jelliffe* (*vide* the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Veneris, 11° *Maii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.
Earl of Derby.
Earl of Onslow.
Viscount Gordon (*Earl of Aberdeen.*)
Lord Clinton.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.
Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Rothschild.
Lord Monkswell.
Lord Thring.

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Tuesday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and, having been sworn, are examined, viz.:—Miss *Beatrice Potter*, Mr. *Charles Freak*, *Soloman Franks*, *A. J. Felz*, and Mr. *Lewis Lyons* (further examined (*vide* the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Martis, 15° *Maii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of Derby.
Earl of Onslow.
Viscount Gordon (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord Clinton.
Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Monkswell.
Lord Thring.

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Friday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and, having been sworn, are examined, viz.:—Rev. *William Adamson* (further examined), Mr. *William Parnell* (further examined), Mr. *Lewis Lyons* (further examined), Mr. *Thomas Jelliffe* (further examined), Mr. *Harry Ham*, and Mr. *George Elcock* (*vide* the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Tuesday, 5th of June, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Martis, 5° *Junii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.
Earl of Derby.
Earl of Onslow.
Viscount Gordon (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord Clinton.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.
Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Rothschild.
Lord Monkswell.
Lord Thring.

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Tuesday, the 15th of May last, are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and, having been sworn, are examined, viz.:—*Myor Wilchinski*, *William John Price*, Mr. *Frederick Samuel Miers* (*vide* the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Veneris, 8° *Junii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of Derby.
Earl of Onslow.
Viscount Gordon (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord Clinton.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.
Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Rothschild.
Lord Monkswell.
Lord Thring.

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Tuesday last are read.

The following Witness is called in, and, having been sworn, is examined, viz.:—Mr. *Peter Van Damme* (*vide* the Evidence).

The room is cleared.

The following resolution is moved by the Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*), "That no further evidence of the nature tendered by Mr. Peter Van Damme be received."

Objected to.

On Question:

Contents, 2.	Not Contents, 7.
Lord Clinton.	Earl of Derby.
Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).	Earl of Onslow.
	Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.
	Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
	Lord Sandhurst.
	Lord Monkswell.
	Lord Thring.

The Witness is again called in, and further examined (*vide* the Evidence).

The following Witnesses are also called in, and, having been sworn, are examined, viz.:—Mr. *William Franklin Dickson*, Mr. *Thomas Clarke*, Mr. *Henry Waltham*, *Thomas Broider*, *Thomas Shaughnessy*, Mr. *John Boswell Richards*, *William Adams*, Mr. *Julius Adolphe Deintje*, and Mr. *Arnold White* (further examined) (*vide* the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Martis, 12° *Junii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.	Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).
Earl of Derby.	Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl.*)
Earl of Onslow.	Lord Sandhurst.
Viscount Gordon (*Earl of Aberdeen*).	Lord Monkswell.
Lord Clinton.	Lord Thring.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.	

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Friday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and, having been sworn, are examined, viz:—Mr. *Arnold White* (further examined), Mr. *John Thomas Morrison*, *Bernard Dunn*, *John Corin*, *Jabez Smith*, *William Harcombe*, *Charles Compton*, and Mr. *Julius Adolph Deintje* (further examined) (*vide* the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Veneris, 15° *Junii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.	Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Earl of Derby.	Lord Rothschild.
Lord Clinton.	Lord Monkswell.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.	Lord Thring.
Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).	

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Tuesday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and, having been sworn, are examined, viz.:—Mr. *Julius Adolph Deintje* (further examined), the Rev. *R. C. Billing*, Mr. *Frederick Charles Baum* (further examined), Mr. *Henry Davis*, Mr. *Isidor Reubenson*, and Mr. *George Edmund Holland* (*vide* the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Martis, 19° *Junii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of Derby.
Earl of Onslow.
Viscount Gordon (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord Clinton.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.
Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Monkswell.

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Friday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and, having been sworn, are examined, viz.:—Mr. *Lionel Lindo Alexander*, Mr. *Solomon Green*, and Mr. *Edward Simmons* (*vide* the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Veneris, 22° *Junii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.
Earl of Derby.
Earl of Onslow.
Viscount Gordon (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord Clinton.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.
Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Rothschild.
Lord Monkswell.
Lord Thring.

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Tuesday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and, having been sworn, are examined, viz.:-The Rev. Dr. *Hermann Adler* and Mr. *John Blundell Maple*, M.P. (*vide* the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Martis, 26° *Junii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.
Earl of Derby.
Earl of Onslow.
Viscount Gordon (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord Clinton.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.
Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Rothschild.
Lord Monkswell.
Lord Thring.

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Friday last are read.

The following Witness is called in, and, having been sworn, is further examined, viz.:—Mr. *John Blundell Maple*, M.P. (*vide* the Evidence).

The room is cleared.

It is moved, That the Chairman do inform the Witness that "The Committee are aware that great pains have been taken, and that considerable sums of money have been expended by Mr. Arnold White on this inquiry. The fact has been mentioned in evidence by Mr. White; but nothing has been brought before the Committee showing that there has been any attempt to obtain untrue evidence, or to deal corruptly with Witnesses. Unless, therefore, it is your intention to produce proof of such practices, the Committee see no reason for going into the question."

Objected to.

On Question:

Contents, 6.	Not Contents, 2.
Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.	Earl of Onslow.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.	Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).	
Lord Sandhurst.	
Lord Monkswell.	
Lord Thring.	

The Witness is called in and informed accordingly.

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Veneris, 29° *Junii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.	Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Earl of Derby.	Lord Sandhurst.
Earl of Onslow.	Lord Rothschild.
Viscount Gordon (*Earl of Aberdeen*).	Lord Monkswell.
Lord Clinton.	Lord Thring.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.	
Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).	

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Tuesday last are read.

The following Resolution is moved by the Lord Rothschild: "That Mr. Maple be informed that the Committee, in addition to hearing evidence involving charges of corruption and intimidation, are prepared to receive evidence that undue inducements had been offered for the production of evidence before the Committee, and that Mr. Maple be asked if he wishes to give evidence on this point."

It is then moved by the Lord Thring to leave out all the words after the first "Committee," for the purpose of inserting the following words, "will, if they find it desirable, satisfy themselves at the proper stage, as to the manner in which the evidence brought before them has been collected."

Objected to.

On Question, That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Resolution:

Contents, 4.	Not Contents, 8.
Earl of Onslow.	Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.
Lord Clinton.	Earl of Derby.
Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).	Viscount Gordon (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord Rothschild.	Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.
	Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
	Lord Sandhurst.
	Lord Monkswell.
	Lord Thring.

The

The words proposed by the Lord Thring are then inserted, and the Resolution, as amended, is agreed to.

The following Witness is then called, and having been sworn, is further examined, viz.:—Mr. *John Blundell Maple*, M.P. (*vide* the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Martis, 3° *Julii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of Derby.
Earl of Onslow.
Lord Clinton.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.
Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Monkswell.
Lord Thring.

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Friday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and, having been sworn, are examined, viz.:—Mr. *John Blundell Maple*, M.P. (further examined), Mr. *Edward Rayner*, and Mr. *Frederick Coupees* (*vide* the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Veneris, 6° *Julii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of Derby.
Earl of Onslow.
Viscount Gordon (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord Clinton.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.
Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Rothschild.
Lord Monkswell.
Lord Thring.

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Tuesday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and, having been sworn, are examined, viz.:—Mr. *David Gardiner Imlay*, *Charles Piper*, *George Bailey*, and Mr. *Horace Regnart* (*vide* the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Lunæ, 9° *Julii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.
Earl of Derby.
Earl of Onslow.
Lord Clinton.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.
Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Monkswell.

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Friday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and, having been sworn, are examined, viz.:—Mr. *Horace Regnart* (further examined), Mr. *Thomas Fisher*, Mr. *John Wicks*, Mr. *George Harrison*, Mr. *William Wright*, Mr. *Harris Lebus*, Mr. *James Corp*, Mr. *John Paddy*, Mr. *Robert Dallas*, Mr. *James Watson*, Mr. *Richard Cooper*, and Mr. *William Parnell* (further examined).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till To-morrow, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Martis, 10° *Julii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of Derby.
Earl of Onslow.
Viscount Gordon (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord Clinton.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.
Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Monkswell.
Lord Thring.

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of yesterday are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and, having been sworn, are examined, viz.:—The Reverend *R. C. Billing*, D.D. (further examined), Mr. *Samuel Montagu*, M.P., Mr. *Edward Madden*, *Woolf Zeitlin*, Mr. *Edward M'Leod*, and Mr. *John Holly* (*vide* the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Jovis, 12° *Julii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of Onslow.
Lord Clinton.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.
Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Monkswell.
Lord Thring.

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Tuesday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and, having been sworn, are examined, viz.:—Mr. *Francis Terrell*, Mr. *Percy Herbert Atkinson*, Mr. *William Parnell* (further examined), Mr. *Frederick Charles Baum* (further examined), Mr. *Mark Moses*, Mr. *Julius Adolph Deintje* (further examined), and Mr. *Joseph Tregenna* (*vide* the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till To-morrow, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Veneris, 13° *Julii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.
Earl of Onslow.
Lord Clinton.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.
Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Monkswell.
Lord Thring.

It is moved, That the EARL of ONSLOW do take the Chair, in the absence of the LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).

The same is agreed to.

Order of adjournment read.

The

The Proceedings of the Committee of yesterday are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and, having been sworn, are examined, viz.:—Mr. *Mark Moses* (further examined), Miss *Rachel Gashion*, *Samuel Spyer*, *Morris Marks*, Miss *Annie Sessions*, Miss *Jane Sessions*, Mr. *Julius Levy*, and Mr. *Gabriel Wortman* (*vide* the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Martis, 16° *Julii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.
Earl of Derby.
Earl of Onslow.
Viscount Gordon (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord Clinton.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.
Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).
Earl Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Monskwell.
Lord Thring.

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Friday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and, having been sworn, are examined, viz.:—Mr. *William John Macqueen*, Mr. *Alfred Jordan Hollington*, Mr. *Charles Edwin Sheppard*, *Edmund Wheatley*, Miss *Adelaide Salter*, *Ignac Poswa*, and Mr. *Barnett Marcus* (*vide* the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Jovis, 19° *Julii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of Onslow.
Lord Clinton.
Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Monkswell.
Lord Thring.

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Tuesday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and, having been sworn, are examined, viz.:—Mr. *John Arthur Craig*, Mr. *Jacob Flatau*, Mr. *Thomas Lilley*, Mr. *John Branch*, and Mr. *Henry Newman* (*vide* the Evidence).

Room cleared.

It is moved by the Earl of *Onslow*, That Mr. *Evan C. Nepean*, Director of Army Contracts, be examined on Monday next.

Objected to.

On Question:

Contents, 3.	Not Contents, 2.
Earl of Onslow.	Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord Clinton.	Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Monkswell.	

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Monday next, at Eleven o'clock.

Die Lunæ, 23° *Julii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of Derby.	Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).
Earl of Onslow.	Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Clinton.	Lord Monkswell.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.	Lord Thring.

It is moved, That the EARL of ONSLOW do take the Chair, in the absence of the LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).

The same is agreed to.

The following Witnesses are called in, and, having been sworn (Mr. *Bramwell Booth* affirming), are examined, viz.:—Mr. *Evan C. Nepean*, C.B., Mr. *William John Compton*, Mr. *Joseph George Plum*, *The Honourable Robert Wellesley Grosvenor*, Mr. *Abram Marks*, Mr. *Lewis Lyons*, Mr. *Jacob Smith*, Mr. *Hermann Wilkie*, Mr. *W. Bramwell Booth*, and Mr. *George Dalhousie Ramsey*, C.B. (*vide* the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Monday next, at Eleven o'clock.

Die Lunii, 30° *Julii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of Derby.	Lord Kenry (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Earl of Onslow.	Lord Monkswell.
Lord Clinton.	Lord Thring.
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.	
Lord Foxford (*Earl of Limerick*).	

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*) in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Monday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and, having been sworn, are examined, viz.:—Mr. *J. B. Clarke* and Mr. *Sidney Herbert King* (*vide* the Evidence).

It is resolved, That leave be obtained to report from time to time.

A DRAFT REPORT is laid before the Committee by the *Chairman*.

The same is considered, several amendments are made therein, and the same, as amended, is agreed to (*vide* First Report).

Ordered, That the Lord in the Chair do make the said Report to The House.

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned *sine die*.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

LIST OF WITNESSES.

Die Veneris, 23° *Martii*, 1888.

	PAGE.
Mr. Morris Stephany	3
Mr. Charles Booth	25

Die Veneris, 13° *Aprilis*, 1888.

Mr. Arnold Henry White	35
Samuel Wildman	55
Mayer Feilweil	61
Solomon Hirsch	63

Die Martis, 17° *Aprilis*, 1888.

Samuel Wildman	65
Charles Solomon	68
Solomon Rosenberg	79
Solomon Baum	91
Mr. William Hoffman	94

Die Veneris, 20° *Aprilis*, 1888.

Mr. William Hoffman	101
Mr. Arnold Henry White	119
The Reverend James Munro	131

Die Martis, 24° *Aprilis*, 1888.

The Reverend James Munro	137, 157
Mr. William Hawes	144
Mrs. Isabella Killick	149
Mrs. Mary Hayes	152, 157
Mrs. Lavinia Casey	155
Mrs. Frances Amelia Liddle	158
Mrs. Susan Attewell	159
Mrs. Eliza Glazier	161
Mr. Lewis Lyons	163

Die Veneris, 27° *Aprilis*, 1888.

Mr. Arnold Henry White	177, 207
Mr. Lewis Lyons	178
Mr. Solomon Plattman	202

Die Martis, 1° *Maii*, 1888.

	PAGE.
Mr. Arnold Henry White	209
Henry Miller	229
Joseph Matthew Tisshaw	243

Die Veneris, 4° *Maii*, 1888.

The Reverend William Adamson	247
Woolf Silverman	271
Isaac Levy	273
Barnett Cohen	274
Fanny Eisenberger	276

Die Martis, 8° *Maii*, 1888.

Mr. William Parnell	279
Mr. Frederick Charles Baum	298
Henry Miller	310
Mr. Thomas Jelliffe	313

Die Veneris, 11° *Maii*, 1888.

Miss Beatrice Potter	319
Mr. Charles Freak	334
Solomon Franks	340
A. J. Felz	344
Mr. Lewis Lyons	347

Die Martis, 15° *Maii*, 1888.

The Reverend William Adamson	353
Mr. William Parnell	353
Mr. Lewis Lyons	354
Mr. Thomas Jelliffe	371
Mr. Harry Ham	374
Mr. George Elcock	382

Die Martis, 5° *Junii*, 1888.

Myor Wilchinski	391
William John Price	406
Mr. Frederick Samuel Miers	412

Die Veneris, 8° *Junii*, 1888.

PAGE.
Mr. Peter Van Damme - - - - 425
Mr. William Franklin Dickson - - 428
Mr. Thomas Clarke - - - - 430
Mr. Henry Waltham - - - - 431
Thomas Broider - - - - - 433
Thomas Shaughnessy - - - - 440
Mr. John Boswell Richards - - - 443
William Adams - - - - - 450
Mr. Julius Adolph Deintje - - - 451
Mr. Arnold Henry White - - - 455

Die Martis, 12° *Junii*, 1888.

Mr. Arnold Henry White - - - 457
Mr. John Thomas Morrison - - - 465
Bernard Dunn - - - - - 471
John Corin - - - - - - 477
Jabez Smith - - - - - - 480
William Harcombe - - - - 484
Charles Compton - - - - - 486
Mr. Julius Adolph Deintje - - - 487

Die Veneris, 15° *Junii*, 1888.

Mr. Julius Adolph Deintje - - - 489
The Reverend R. C. Billing - - - 493
Mr. Frederick Charles Baum - - - 509
Mr. Henry Davis - - - - - 509
Mr. Isidor Reubenson - - - - 516
Mr. George Edmund Holland - - 517

Die Martis, 19° *Junii*, 1888.

Mr. Lionel Lindo Alexander - - - 523
Mr. Solomon Green - - - - 551
Mr. Edward Simmons - - - - 552

Die Veneris, 22° *Junii*, 1888.

The Reverend Dr. Hermann Adler - 561
Mr. John Blundell Maple, M.P. - - 568

Die Martis, 26° *Junii*, 1888.

Mr. John Blundell Maple, M.P. - - 591

Die Veneris, 29° *Junii*, 1888.

Mr. Frederick Baker Kirby - - - 607
Mr. John Blundell Maple, M.P. - - 614

Die Martis, 3° *Julii*, 1888.

Mr. John Blundell Maple, M.P. - - 637
Mr. Edward Rayner - - - - 670
Mr. Frederick Coupees - - - - 678

Die Veneris, 6° *Julii*, 1888.

PAGE.
Mr. David Gardiner Imlay - - - 679
Charles Piper - - - - - 707
George Bailey - - - - - 709
Mr. Horace Regnart - - - - 710

Die Lunæ, 9° *Julii*, 1888.

Mr. Horace Regnart - - - 715, 744
Thomas Fisher - - - - - 737
John Wicks - - - - - - 743
Mr. George Harrison - - - - 745
Mr. William Wright - - - - 747
Mr. Harris Lebus - - - - - 749
James Corp - - - - - - 751
Mr. John Paddy - - - - - 757
Mr. Robert Dallas - - - - 758
Mr. James Watson - - - - 759
Mr. Richard Cooper - - - - 759
Mr. William Parnell - - - - 759

Die Martis, 10° *Julii*, 1888.

The Reverend R. C. Billing, D.D. - - 763
Mr. Samuel Montagu, M.P. - - - 765
Mr. Edward Madden - - - - 767
Woolf Zeitlin - - - - - 778
Mr. Edward M'Leod - - - - 786
Mr. John Holley - - - - - 791

Die Jovis, 12° *Julii*, 1888.

Mr. Francis Terrell - - - 807, 815
Mr. Percy Herbert Atkinson - 807, 818, 833
Mr. William Parnell - - - 820, 840
Mr. Frederick Charles Baum - - - 823
Mr. Mark Moses - - - - - 823
Mr. Julius Adolph Deintje - - 834, 837
Mr. Joseph Tregenna - - - - 835

Die Veneris, 13° *Julii*, 1888.

Mr. Mark Moses - - - - - 843
Miss Rachel Gashion - - - 875, 883
Samuel Spyer - - - - - 877
Morris Marks - - - - - 878
Miss Annie Sessions - - - - 880
Miss Jane Sessions - - - - 881
Mr. Julius Levy - - - - - 883
Mr. Gabriel Wortman - - - - 885

Die Martis, 16° *Julii*, 1888.

	PAGE.
Mr. William John Macqueen - -	889
Mr. Alfred Jordan Hollington - -	893
Mr. Charles Edwin Sheppard - -	912
Edmund Wheatley - - - -	922
Miss Adelaide Salter - - - -	923
Ignac Poswa - - - - -	924
Mr. Barnett Marcus - - -	925

Die Jovis, 19° *Julii*, 1888.

Mr. John Arthur Craig - - -	931
Mr. Jacob Flatau - - - - -	945
Mr. Thomas Lilley - - - -	959
Mr. John Branch - - - - -	963
Mr. Henry Newman - - - -	965

Die Lunæ, 23° *Julii*, 1888.

	PAGE.
Mr. Evan C. Nepean, C.B. - - -	969
Mr. William John Compton - - -	983
Mr. Joseph George Plum - - -	988
The Hon. Robert Wellesley Grosvenor -	994
Mr. Abram Marks - - - -	996
Mr. Lewis Lyons - - - - -	999
Mr. Jacob Smith - - - - -	1002
Mr. Hermann Wilkie - - - -	1003
Mr. W. Bramwell Booth - - -	1005
Mr. George Dalhousie Ramsay, C.B .-	1007

Die Lunæ, 30° *Julii*, 1888.

Mr. Thomas Clarke - - - -	1017
Mr. Sidney Herbert King - - -	1018

Die Veneris, 23° Martii, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of CANTERBURY.
Earl of DERBY.
Earl of ONSLOW.
Viscount GORDON (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord CLINTON.
Lord CLIFFORD of CHUDLEIGH.
Lord FOXFORD (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord ROTHSCHILD.
Lord MONKSWELL.
Lord THRING.

LORD KENRY (EARL OF DUNRAVEN AND MOUNT-EARL), IN THE CHAIR.

MR. MORRIS STEPHANY, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

1. *Chairman.*] YOU are the Secretary of the Jewish Board of Guardians, are you not?
I am.

2. Would you tell the Committee exactly what the Jewish Board of Guardians is?
The Jewish Board of Guardians is established for the relief of the Jewish poor resident in London. We have various branches connected with the institution. One of the principal branches is relief given to old and decrepit persons, and widows' weekly allowances. Another kind of assistance is that we help persons to help themselves by giving them sums of money both in the way of gift and also of loan. Another department connected with the institution is called the industrial department; it was formerly started for the purpose of lending sewing machines to tailors, but of late years we have not been lending very many, because the manufacturers have lent them on the same terms that we hitherto did; but the industrial committee for some years past have taken up a branch of apprenticeship; we apprentice young people of both sexes to various trades; they are indented for a certain number of years, and the premiums advanced to the parents by way of loan; and that money is repaid by the apprentices out of their weekly wages, so that at the end of the time the youth can say, "Well, I have certainly been apprenticed under the auspices of the Jewish Board of Guardians, but it has not been a charity; I have repaid the money." That branch of the institution has been very successful indeed. There are a very large number of trades (I think, without counting them, there are about 70 different trades) that which we apprentice the boys to. As I said before, that has been very successful indeed, and it is doing a very good work amongst the Jewish poor. Another department is the loan department; we lend sums of money from 1 *l.* to 25 *l.* upon personal security without any interest being required, and it is paid back by small instalments of 6 *d.* per week in the pound; we do not charge any expenses in any way at all. Another department is the work-rooms; that is established in Bishopsgate-street (not adjoining the office), where a number of girls are apprenticed to learn dressmaking, gold and worsted embroidery, and other kinds of work which require female labour, keeping in mind that it is for

needlework of all kinds but not tailoring; they do not teach tailoring. The object of the work-rooms is really to teach girls dressmaking and other kinds of work which would be more useful for them in after life. Of course with tailoring they would be required to go out to work; but with dressmaking and fancy embroidering, and so forth, it is understood that that work might be able to be done at home, and be a great benefit to them in after life. That also is successful. The next committee we have is one, as I said before, for the supervision of weekly allowances, that is, to old and decrepit persons. We have also a visiting committee connected with the Board who visit the poor, and we also have an emigration committee. We assist poor persons to emigrate to America and the Colonies, and to other parts, but we do not send destitute persons away, as is shown in our report, which states that it is required of every person who wishes to emigrate that he should produce half the passage money himself, which assures us that he cannot be in a destitute condition. We have sent a very large number of persons from time to time to America, and I am able to assert that not one of our cases has ever been returned by the Commissioners of Emigration in New York; which really convinces us that we select the proper persons to emigrate, that they are not destitute on arrival. We also see, before sending them, that they have at least some one on the other side who is willing to receive them and look after them; that is almost a *sine quâ non*; we have never sent a family away unless we were convinced that they would be received on the other side. The next is the sanitary committee. That department has been established now about four years. We have a paid sanitary inspector who visits the houses of the poor that we consider chargeable to us, that is, those that we relieve. He sees that the houses are kept in a proper sanitary condition, and then communicates with the local authorities that they should see that the proper sanitary arrangements are carried out. What we do is this: of course we have no legal power with them, but we go in more for moral persuasion. We first draw the attention of the landlord to the matter, and I must say that in most cases we are successful in that way, because I think they would rather have a person such as our sanitary officer call their attention to it than have a representation from the local authorities, which would be more in the nature of a complaint than anything else. We have been very successful with the landlords in that respect, and we find that the dwellings of the poor are certainly in a much better condition than they were some years ago; and also, we have the co-operation of the local authorities in respect of the sanitation, and I think they have admitted that we do certainly a great portion of their work. They are very thankful to us, and render every assistance to see that the owners of the property keep it in a proper condition. We also have a ladies' visiting committee. The ladies visit the houses of the poor, and advise the women to keep their apartments tidy, and also when they find cases of distress, and the women might be somewhat employed during the week when they are not required to attend to their household duties, they give them work to do, which is collected from a number of charitable ladies, and they are paid small amounts for the work; and at the end of the season the work is sold, principally to the poor themselves, because the cost of the work is reckoned as nil, and the clothing is sold at almost the cost of the material itself. Of course it is made up into suitable garments for poor children and women and men, and so forth. And we recently had our sale (it comes just this season of the year), and most of the things are bought up by the poor themselves. I think I have gone through the whole of the various committees. As I said before, the principal is the relief department; and our sole aim is, not to give out doles of relief, but to help people who can help themselves. If we see that a man is desirous of work, and that a few pounds will help him up, we do invariably give him that assistance.

3. Are the operations of your society extended over the whole of London?
Over the whole of London.

4. And you therefore are well acquainted with the general condition of the Jewish poor over the whole metropolis?
I am.

5. Especially

5. Especially so in the East End?
More especially in the East End.

6. Lord *Clinton.*] Is your board of guardians connected with a Government department?
No; it is a voluntary institution.

7. *Chairman.*] Would you explain to the Committee what you understand by what is commonly described as the sweating system, and state to what trades it applies?
The sweating system I take to mean that the work is taken from a merchant by a contractor, who lets it out again to a sub-contractor, and he employs a number of men to do the work. But I think the contracting system is dying out; that most of the work is taken now from the merchant by what is termed the sweater, who employs (making use of the word again) the sweatees, that is the workmen. It is very largely carried on in the tailoring trade; but I think your Lordships will find that it is also carried on in almost every other trade, and notably the cabinet-making; in that trade I believe it is carried on very largely indeed.

8. But probably principally in the tailoring trade?
Very largely; but I think in almost every trade you will find it.

9. A sweater may be described as a middleman?
Yes.

10. And there may be several of them employed intervening between the actual produce of the clothes and the buyer of the clothes?
That is so.

11. Have you any idea how many Jews are employed in the tailoring trade
I have not. I have prepared answers to the questions handed to me by Lord Onslow, and if it would please your Lordships I would like to read the statement, as it deals principally with the questions you put to me on the last occasion.

12. Does it bear upon the general circumstances of the trade?
Quite so.

13. Will you please proceed?
The first of the questions handed to me by Lord Onslow is, if I have made any detailed or general inquiry into the extent of the sweating system in the East End, and the numbers of people therein employed. My own personal knowledge (to which for the moment at any rate I confine myself) is necessarily limited to those applications which come before me from persons who have been at work under the sweating system, and who receive employment from the sweaters. When in employment they are always able to keep themselves without charity; the wages are sufficient, in some cases amply sufficient, so that even when on the most reduced scale they keep themselves independent of charity. Frequently the Jewish poor cannot get work at low wages from the sweater, as they can get no work at all; it is then that they apply to our institution. I think that would answer the first question.

14. Earl of *Onslow.*] I asked more particularly as to the extent of the sweating system; can you give us any figures as to the numbers?
I cannot.

15. *Chairman.*] I gather from you that you would only be cognisant of those who are obliged to apply to you for relief?
That is so.

16. You can give us no idea as to the numbers employed?
No.

17. Can you give us any idea as to whether the proportion between Jewish and other labour is increasing or decreasing?
I do not think it is decreasing; but I might say that a very large number of

Jews are maintained in the tailoring trade, more especially the slop-tailoring trade.

18. Earl of *Limerick.*] Can you say the number employed in the boot-making trade?
I have not been able to get that out.

19. Lord *Thring.*] Taking the number of applicants to you for charity, what proportion do the sweatees bear to the remaining number of applicants?
Last year we had 698 tailors of all classes, male and female, and connected with the different branches; that is, the machinists, the pressers, the basters, the buttonhole hands; all included make 698.

20. And what is your total number of applicants?
Our total number of applicants relieved was 3,313.

21. Do you think that that shows at all the proportion; could we assume that the sweatees bear to the whole number of Jews somewhat the same proportion as your applicants bear to the residue?
No, I do not think so.

22. Earl of *Onslow.*] I see that, in your report for 1886, you publish a table giving the different trades that the applicants for relief worked in; and apparently the great majority of those are what I may term clothing trades generally, are they not. It is on page 53 of the report of 1886?
I do not think you will find that. I have the number against 1886 as 947.

23. Out of a total of what?
Out of a total, taking the working class, of 2,565.

24. Do you know at all how many trades there are down?
I have not counted that.

25. A large number?
A very large number.

26. And 900 for one trade would be a considerable proportion, would it not?
A very considerable proportion. But that year I may mention was rather exceptional. I have gone through our volume of reports, and I find that it was never so high as then. That was on account of a special fund that was raised, called the Mansion House Relief Fund, in the commencement of 1886, and for a space of two months we had a very large number of applicants. From 1886 to 1887 you see already a drop of 250 nearly.

27. One thing more upon these figures; you have not taken out at all what the proportion of the clothing trades is to the whole number?
No.

28. Because I see in part of your report you find fault with some figures compiled upon the subject, in which it is said that 33 per cent. of them are engaged in sweating trades; the report says that is not the case; have you verified that?
I have not verified it. (*Vide* Appendix A.)

29. *Chairman.*] How long have you been secretary?
I have been secretary nine years. I have been connected with the institution 21 years.

30. Is the number of applicants falling off or increasing since you became secretary?
Last year the number showed certainly a decrease over 1886.

31. As regards, say the last five years, is there a general increase or a general decrease?
I take it, taking round figures, that there is not an increase. I have in my hand the figures for the last four years, and in 1885 there were 3,400; in 1884, there were 3,000; 4,000 in 1886; and 3,300 in 1887; so that I do not think you could call that an increase.

32. Earl

32. Earl of *Limerick.*] Have your applicants generally been some considerable time in England before they come to you for relief?
Yes; we have a law that a person must reside in London, at least six months before he can receive any assistance.

33. Lord *Rothschild.*] That rule is honoured more in the breach than the observance, is it not?
We carry it out as far as we possibly can.

34. But anybody in a state of destitution you would relieve?
We would not allow him to starve.

35. Lord *Monkswell.*] Do you oblige a person coming from the country, as well as one coming from abroad, to reside in London for six months before you relieve him?
Yes.

36. *Chairman.*] Have you read the Report on the Sweating System made to the Board of Trade by their labour correspondent?
I have.

37. I see he says there that the number of foreign tailors appears to be reckoned at 60 per cent., or even 80 per cent., of the whole; do you consider that to be anything like a correct estimate?
I think that is somewhat heavy; because it must be borne in mind that the tailoring trade is split up; that is, mostly the coat trade is in the hands of the Jews, but the waistcoat and trouser-making is certainly mostly in the hands of Christians.

38. Earl of *Onslow.*] Male or female?
Both.

39. Is there any large number of male Christians employed in the children's trouser-making trade?
So I have been given to understand.

40. *Chairman.*] You are speaking of the East End tailoring trade?
Yes, of the East End tailoring trade.

41. Lord *Thring.*] You do not speak at all of the West End tailoring trade?
No, I cannot. We have but very few of those employed in the West End, because they are better workmen; they are employed on the best work, and of course would earn a better wage.

42. *Chairman.*] In fact from your knowledge you can give us no opinion as to whether the number of foreigners employed in the trade has been increasing, or decreasing, or stationary?
I do not think it is increasing. I can only go by the cases that come directly under my notice, and that is what I form my opinion upon.

43. Earl of *Onslow.*] Do you think that it rises and falls with the number of Jewish immigrants that come into this country and apply to your board for relief?
No, I do not think that affects them.

44. Do you think it is steadily declining or increasing; I mean the entering into the tailoring trade of foreigners?
I do not think it is declining; I think I might say it is remaining stationary.

45. Earl of *Derby.*] I suppose we may take it that you have no personal knowledge of these matters except as regards persons who apply to your society for relief?
That is so.

46. *Chairman.*] Do you have applications for relief from both employers and employed; do you get any sweaters applying to you for relief?
Yes, we have a very few sweaters applying to us.

47. Lord *Thring.*] Can you tell the Committee the number of Jews last year who immigrated into London?

Only as far as our annual report goes; but I take it that that question will certainly be put to us by the Committee appointed by the House of Commons, and we shall then be prepared with full statistics upon the matter.

48. Earl of *Onslow.*] I think it would be useful if you could give us from these reports the number of cases that have been dealt with by your society, the Jewish Board of Guardians, in the different years, beginning with the year 1883; could you do that?

Yes.

49. Dividing them into natives, foreigners, who have been more than seven years, and foreigners who have been less than seven years in England?

Shall I give you the numbers year by year.

50. Yes; begin with 1883?

In 1883 there were 2,882 cases relieved; out of that number there were 466 natives, 1,143 strangers resident here more than seven years, and 1,273 foreigners resident here less than seven years.

51. Now take 1884?

Three thousand and fifty-four total cases; 426 natives, 1,172 foreigners resident here more than seven years, and 1,456 foreigners resident here less than seven years.

52. Now 1885?

Three thousand four hundred and eight cases; 424 natives, 1,113 foreigners resident here more than seven years, 1,871 cases resident here less than seven years.

53. Now 1886?

Four thousand one hundred and thirty-nine cases; 491 natives, 1,426 foreigners resident here more than seven years, and 2,222 foreigners resident here less than seven years.

54. Can you tell me, before we leave 1886, how many of those were Russians and Poles, and how many of them were Germans?

Yes. In 1886 we had 962 Russians and Poles resident here more than seven years, and 1,888 Russians and Poles resident here less than seven years; the Germans were 97 resident here over seven years, and 267 less than seven years.

55. Have you got the figures for 1887?

Yes.

56. Will you give us those too?

Total, 3,313 cases; 451 natives, 1,348 foreigners resident here more than seven years, and 1,514 foreigners resident here less than seven years.

57. Then is the net result of that that there has been a steady increase since 1883 up to the year 1886, after which it fell back again to about the number in 1885?

That is so, I think.

58. Can you give any reason to account for that sudden rise in 1886?

Yes; we had a very large number of persons expelled from Germany at that time; an order was made which compelled all aliens to leave Germany. At the commencement of 1886 we had rather a large influx.

59. And was not that also the year in which the Mansion House Fund was distributed?

Yes.

60. Earl of *Limerick.*] What you have just mentioned applied not only to London but to other parts of the United Kingdom, I think, reaching even to Ireland?

Quite so.

61. *Chairman.*]

61. *Chairman.*] You said that you would be prepared to give to the Committee of the House of Commons full information as to the amount of immigration?
Yes; we should be quite prepared to do that.

62. How do you obtain that information?
Only from statistics.

63. By inquiries of your own society?
No, we should take it from the statistics on our books.

64. Cannot you, at the same time, get information as to the trades or occupations of the immigrants?
We could only do that in the case of those who apply to us.

65. Earl of *Onslow.*] But may we not take it that the figures we have just been going through, fairly indicate the immigration of Jews into this country; not accurately, but fairly indicate it?
Yes, fairly.

66. Then can you not from those figures take the different trades, and give us some idea of what the increase or decrease of the number employed in those trades is?
Yes, I could do that.

67. *Chairman.*] That is the point the Committee would like to have cleared up; the information as to the increase or decrease in the cheap tailoring trade and other trades, to which the sweating system applies?
It would take some time to refer to that.

68. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Do you happen to know whether a large number of persons who apply to you for relief, are persons who have only just landed in England, say within two or three months; do you have a large number of applicants for relief among those who have just come to the country?
No; we do not have a very large number of them.

69. *Chairman.*] You spoke just now of a Visiting Committee and a Sanitary Committee?
Yes.

70. Have they made any report that you could put in?
Yes. The Sanitary Committee have reported (*handing in a Report*).

71. Have you also a report from the Visiting Committee?
Yes; that is embodied in the General Report of the Board. The Visiting Committee is almost confined to the fixed allowances. I mean the cases that receive fixed allowances; because every case before it receives relief, what I call general relief, is visited by the investigating officers of the Board.

72. Do you see the applicants for relief yourself?
I do see them all in person.

73. What kind of inquiries do you make as to their circumstances and condition?
I take their statement first verbally, and if I consider the case one that should go before our Relief Committee (which, I might state, meets twice a-week) the case is put down for the next sitting of the Committee; and previous to the person appearing, his case is investigated by the investigating officers of the Board.

74. Do you visit the homes or workshops of these people yourself?
No.

75. Lord *Thring.*] Does the Committee understand from you that it is your opinion that the immigrants are not generally in a state of pauperism when they come to England?
Generally, I should say no; they are not in a state of pauperism.

76. In other words, they do not want relief when they come?
Not immediately on arrival.

77. Who pays their fares?
They generally pay them themselves, or at times I have known them to be assisted by various persons or institutions on the Continent.

78. Then are we to understand that you consider that they come with money in their pockets to a certain extent?
Yes.

79. Generally speaking, to what extent can they maintain themselves for a week?
Certainly. Of course there are cases where they cannot; but taking it as the general rule, I should say decidedly yes.

80. For a month?
Yes, more.

81. For six months?
Quite so. To confirm what I have just stated, I may state that the report of our Board will show that we had during 1887 only 249 cases who had been resident in London less than one year. Out of that, a very large number were assisted to return back home again; so that it would not be a very large number if we had only 249 the whole year of those resident here less than one year.

82. I thought you said that you could not send them back; that they were turned out of their own country?
They were turned out of Germany; but we could send them back to Russia and Poland.

83. Not the Germans?
The German Jews we should send back to Germany; but they only expelled aliens from Germany.

84. *Chairman.*] Why do you send them back?
If they find they cannot succeed here they return.

85. Earl of *Derby.*] Is there any society which takes charge of them, or assists them on first landing, and helps them to find work?
There is one society which has recently been established, called the "Temporary Shelter;" but they only receive lone men, men that come alone.

86. Earl of *Onslow.*] Can you tell us the proportion of those who state that they know no trade?
I cannot.

87. Lord *Thring.*] Then are the Committee to understand that a considerable portion of the Jewish immigrants are annually sent back to the Continent?
Yes.

88. Regularly?
Regularly.

89. What proportion?
During the year 1887, we returned to the Continent 305 families.

90. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] On what page of your report is that shown?
Page 55; 305 cases; I call a case a family.

91. Lord *Thring.*] In the case of Jews born in Germany, do they not become German subjects?
Yes. I said they expelled aliens; that is, other than Germans; for instance, a Pole, or Russian, or Austrian, residing in Germany; they were expelled under the law I referred.

92. Not being German born?
Not being German born.

93. *Chairman.*]

93. *Chairman.*] Can you tell us how many in the year 1887 went to the United States?

Yes. Taking the United States and Australia (to Australia very few indeed, on account of the cost, a number certainly under 10), 231.

94. Earl of *Limerick.*] Including Canada?

Including Canada.

95. Lord *Monkswell.*] How many went to Canada, and how many to America out of that number?

I have not got them separated here, but from my own personal knowledge I can say that a very small number indeed went to Canada.

96. *Chairman.*] Do you know how many came to this country in 1887; we are told that 536 went out of it?

We had 249 that came in.

97. There was a large balance, therefore, of emigrants over immigrants?

Quite so.

98. Earl of *Derby.*] Do they ever come in to your knowledge under engagement to any employer?

No, I do not believe so.

99. Earl of *Onslow.*] You told us that you had a Ladies' Visiting Committee?

Yes.

100. Do you know at all what are the particular functions of that committee; in what way do they assist the poor Jews?

It is more by advice than relief. They do not go with the idea of relieving the people; they go more to advise them to keep their homes in a tidy and cleanly condition; and, as I stated, where a little help could be given to the woman that she might earn 2 *s.* or 3 *s.* during the week when she was not otherwise employed in her domestic affairs, that work is given to her from this special committee; but it is not looked upon as relief; they do not dispense relief in any way; if they come across cases of distress, they are referred to the officers of the Board.

101. Do they never advance money to the applicant in order that he may apprentice himself to a trade?

No.

102. You have never known of a case of the Ladies' Committee doing that?

No, I have never known of a case of the Ladies' Committee doing that.

103. Is that ever done by your Board of Guardians?

No, we do not do it for men; we do for youths.

104. Do you pay a sum of money to the contractor, in order that he may teach the boy a trade?

That, as I explained, refers to the Industrial Committee. We only apprentice under a deed of apprenticeship, but we never or hardly ever (I might say that we do not) give small sums of money to little men, as I may call them, middle men, to teach a trade, more especially the tailoring or the boot-making trade.

105. That is not done by the Jewish Board of Guardians, or anybody connected with it?

No.

106. Lord *Rothschild.*] When you apprentice boys, you apprentice them to any other trade but the tailoring?

Any other trade but the tailoring, excepting what I would term a first-class tailor; that is, where a boy would have to sit on the table and work right through the various branches; but that is very seldom. We exclude the tailoring and the boot manufacturing, except the clicking; we apprentice to the clicking.

107. Earl of *Onslow.*] Now, you say that the amount of money provided for enabling these people to hire sewing machines is diminishing; but I see, in the Report of 1887, that 63 *l.* 8 *s.* was advanced for that purpose?
Yes; but I call that diminishing; it is diminishing.

108. What number of machines would that represent?
We also lend tools, I should say.

109. Does that cover both machines and tools?
That covers both machines and tools.

110. Is that not done now to any large extent, enabling these people to hire these things?
It is not increasing; because, as I have stated before, the manufacturers themselves lend sewing machines on the hire system.

111. Of course you know these Reports of the Board of Guardians. In the Report of 1887, on page 19, I see you quote a statement that "of the applicants to the Board for relief in 1886 no less than 44 per cent. belonged to the tailoring trade"; and you say, "this is incorrect; the proportion in that trade was only 33 per cent., which proportion exceeds that in the entire body of recipients of relief of all kinds." Now, when you say the tailoring trade, that does not cover all the trades in which sweating is practised, does it?
No.

112. Therefore, if the boot-making trade and machinists and pressers are included, it would be more nearly correct?
Yes, I think so; and the cabinet makers.

113. *Chairman.*] Do you know, as a fact, whether these immigrants often pay a premium to get employment?
I could hardly say that I know that; I can hardly say that it is a general rule.

114. Do you know whether they work for nothing sometimes?
I have not heard that; it has never come under my notice.

115. Earl of *Onslow.*] At any rate, you have never paid a premium for them?
We have never paid a premium for them.

116. *Chairman.*] And I should gather from you that, with regard to the general condition of these Russian and Polish Jewish immigrants, they are comparatively well to do?
You could hardly call them well to do.

117. They could keep themselves for six months without wages, I have gathered from you?
I should not think that a man could keep himself for six months; he would have to do something. I say that very few come here entirely destitute: they may have small means of their own; but I should not like to say that they come over here with sufficient money to keep them in idleness for six months; that would certainly not be correct.

118. Lord *Thring.*] Can you explain the fact that there is a constant stream coming in, in order to be poured out again, according to your evidence?
That is in this way. If they find that they are unsuccessful here, that they cannot get on, then they remove to other parts of the globe.

119. Who sends them here?
They either pay their own fares or else are assisted by charitable institutions on the Continent.

120. *Chairman.*] Are they induced to come over here by practically false representations; advertisements as to the demand for their labour?
I have given a little attention to that, and I have failed to find that advertisements

advertisements have been inserted in the foreign newspapers as to the plentiful supply of work here.

121. Do you take any means to inform the localities from which these people come as to the demand for their labour?

No, we do not; but what we do is this: we are continually making representations to the congregations on the Continent, that is, in Russia and Poland, advising them not to send their poor to London; we have done that on several occasions.

122. Earl of *Onslow.*] I have in my hand an advertisement published in a Cardiff paper in Hebrew, a translation of which runs thus: "Wanted, good cabinet-makers and polishers. Foreign single men preferred to married men. Apply to Mr. Lewis, 42, Adam-street, Cardiff, South Wales." That was alleged to have been published in a Hebrew paper which circulates largely on the Continent; do you think that likely to be a genuine advertisement?

Of course I cannot dispute it, but I should hardly think it was genuine.

123. Lord *Sandhurst.*] You said, I think, that you only see the destitute Jews, the Jews who apply to you for relief?

Yes, mostly.

124. Then is it possible that these destitute Jews on landing are swept into sweaters' shops before you see them or know anything about them?

That might be, of course. Unless they came immediately under my notice I should not know of them.

125. Do you think it is likely that there are what are known as touts on the look-out for them at the landing places, so as to get hold of them before you see them?

Not for the purpose of trade, but merely for the purpose of taking them to the small lodging-houses, and getting whatever they can out of them; it is not a very honourable calling.

126. *Chairman.*] How long is it since your Board instituted a sanitary inspectorship?

Four years.

127. Lord *Rothschild.*] You had a sanitary inspector, I think, in 1867 and 1868, when the cholera broke out?

Yes.

128. Lord *Thring.*] Do the immigrants come with a family, generally; does a man come with his wife and children, or do they come separately?

Both.

129. *Chairman.*] Do you know what led to their instituting this sanitary inspectorship five years ago; was it owing to any special circumstances?

Only that we considered that the parochial authorities did not pay the attention they should to the dwellings of the poor.

130. From your personal knowledge you can tell us nothing as to the condition of their dwellings now?

Only from the report that is given to me, I think that there is marked improvement.

131. Earl of *Onslow.*] Do you think that they are less clean than English people of the same class of life?

I think after they have been here a very short time they become acclimatized. Most of them when they first arrive here, coming from a very distant part, where they have been living in small villages, and in houses of course not built on the same style as they are here, but more like huts, it is difficult for them to acquire any knowledge of sanitation; but after they have been here a short time they fall in with the ways of their neighbours.

132. I notice that in the report a statement is made, or rather proof is adduced, of the Jewish immigrants being dirtier than the Christian residents in the

the East End, the proof being that their death-rate is the same; but in what way do you think that that affords any proof; do you think that that is any proof that they are less cleanly?

I think so.

133. Lord *Clinton.*] But your inspector has no right to enter their houses, has he?

He has no right.

134. It is only by consent of the owner that he can enter them?

Yes.

135. And he might not see the worst?

I might say that he has met with a cordial reception wherever he has been, and he has even gone into houses that are not tenanted by the poor, and he has not yet met with any hostile reception.

136. Never met with any refusal that you know of?

No; or if that should happen he will immediately apply to the local authorities, and at once he is introduced by the local sanitary inspector, and afterwards he is never refused admission.

137. Earl of *Onslow.*] Do you consider that the Public Health Act is administered as stringently as it might be in the East End?

Not so.

138. Would you welcome a more stringent administration of it?

Undoubtedly.

139. *Chairman.*] Do you know at all what the proportion of males to females would be in the tailoring trade?

No; I should not like to give figures, because it would be mere guesswork on my part.

140. Do they generally work together, do you know?

Yes, they do the work in the same workshop.

141. And work the same number of hours?

Yes; of course where the sanitary inspector visits they do not work so long, but, in most cases, I might say that the sanitary condition of the workshops is very bad indeed. I interviewed a few persons on Monday last, being an application day; I took the opportunity of talking to some of the men who applied to us for relief, and I gathered from them a few particulars upon this question, and I might say that in every case it was reported that both males and females were working together, that the sanitary arrangements were very bad indeed; there was only one w.c. for the whole house, which in some cases had to supply tenements besides the workpeople themselves.

142. Your opinion is, that the sanitary condition is generally bad?

Generally bad.

143. Earl of *Derby.*] Are you acquainted with any case where the factory inspector has taken steps to remedy that state of things?

The factory inspector has not any power in the matter.

144. *Chairman.*] How do you account for this bad state of sanitation?

That the factory inspector has no control over them.

145. The sanitary authorities have?

The sanitary authorities have, but they are negligent.

146. You think it is not owing to any defect in the law, but to a defect in the way the law is administered?

Yes; but I should like to see that it was entirely in the hands of the factory inspector, who would have, I think, more control over it than the sanitary inspector.

147. You

147. You think that the sanitary inspector and the factory inspector, in fact, do not work together?
They do not work together, and I think it should be combined in one.

148. Earl of *Limerick.*] I see that on page 8 of this Report of the Sanitary Committee of your Board of Guardians it says, "Section 61 of the Sanitary Act, 1878, exempts from the operation of the provisions which it contains as to overcrowding, ventilation, and other matters, two classes of workshops; (A), domestic workshops, that is, those 'in which the only persons employed are members of the same family dwelling there,' and (B), those 'conducted on the system of not employing children or young persons therein.' Now, in the smaller workshops in East London all the workers are, very often, members of the same family, resident on the premises, and in very rare cases indeed is juvenile labour employed; so that, in fact, however overcrowded a workshop may be, Her Majesty's Inspector is without power to interfere. This power should, in the opinion of the Committee" (that is the sanitary committee, I presume)?
Quite so.

149. "Be conferred upon these officials by the Legislature;" do you agree with that?
Yes.

150. That there is no power now, as regards a considerable number of these small workshops, for the factory inspector to enter?
Yes.

151. *Chairman.*] Is it the case that a good deal of work is carried on, not in factories or workshops, but in private dwellings, in people's own rooms?
Yes, in the cases of those whom you would call the smaller men.

152. In cases where the factory inspector would not have the right to go?
Quite so.

153. Do you attribute a good deal of the evil of the sweating system to that; the overtime that is worked, for instance?
No doubt it is so.

154. Can you give the Committee any information of your own knowledge as to the length of hours worked, and the rate of wages?
Not from my own knowledge, but from the statements I took down on Monday from some of the men who applied to me for assistance.

155. Perhaps you will kindly read the statements which you then took down?
One man said he was aged 32, married, had a wife and three children; he was a tailor; he could earn 6 *s.* per day, and the hours of labour were from 8 to 12 o'clock.

156. Leaving out an hour for dinner?
One hour for dinner only. The master supplied the employés with coffee in the morning for breakfast and tea in the afternoon, but that is supplied to them so that they should not lose the half-hour that should be granted to them. In another case a man said he was married and had four children; he was a machinist; that when he was working on piecework he could earn from 7 *s.* to 8 *s.* a day; of course he left off work whenever he thought proper.

157. Do I understand that these are people who applied for relief?
They were out of work, and they came to me for assistance, and those are the ordinary questions I should put to applicants, as to where they have been employed, how long they have been out of employment, and what was the cause of their distress. He said he could earn 7 *s.* or 8 *s.* per day when he worked on piecework, but when he was compelled to work by the day he received 8 *s.*, and that he had to work from 8 o'clock till 10, and, as before, coffee was supplied for breakfast and tea for tea, and one hour was given for dinner. In this particular case he said that there were five men and five girls at work, and

that the sanitary arrangements were very bad indeed; he would willingly have worked for less money if he could have worked for less hours.

158. Lord *Sandhurst.*] Is this work generally to be got every day all through the week, or only perhaps three days in the week?
Not all through the week.

159. *Chairman.*] Perhaps you would explain to the Committee what the cause of these men applying for relief was?
They had been out of work for some length of time, and they had parted with a great many of their movables, and they were in a state of destitution.

160. You keep an account, of course, of the names and residences of applicants?
Certainly.

161. Do they often come again?
Yes, from time to time.

162. Now these people are generally in receipt of good wages?
Yes. I took them just as they came in, and I found most of them to be in receipt of a very fair amount of wage when they were in work, and that they could carry themselves over for two or three months if they were out of employment, so that when they got into work again they could replace those things that they had been obliged to dispose of, and go on again. There is another case which I took down: a man married, with four children; he said he was a tailor's presser; he worked in a shop where there were 14 hands employed; he could earn 7*s.* a day, but was obliged to work from 8 in the morning till 11 at night; that tea and coffee were supplied as usual by the employer; and I put the question to him, "If you have to work from 8 o'clock to 11 o'clock, I suppose you can take your time as to how you do your work?" "Oh, no," he said, that was not so; he was obliged to press a certain number of coats per day with the assistance of an under-presser, one not so skilful; and in that place there were sometimes eight girls, sometimes nine girls employed, there was only one W.C. to the workshop, and he thought that certainly it was a very bad state of things, considering the number of females and the number of males working together.

163. All working in one room?
They all work in one large room.

164. What do you mean by a large room?
A large workshop, generally built at the rear of the house.

165. Have you any more cases?
No, I have not taken out any more, though I have some others on my notes.

166. In all those three cases you have given females are employed?
In all of them; I took that particularly.

167. Lord *Monkswell.*] And for the same hours?
One of them said that the place had not been visited by the factory inspector; and the girls, too, work late hours.

168. The same hours as the men?
Yes.

169. Lord *Clinton.*] How long have these applicants been out of work; did you ask that question?
I asked that question, but I have not put that on my notes; I should not like to say now from memory. I have the initials of each person down.

170. *Chairman.*] Do you know what rate of wages the girls would be earning?
I should not like to say, because we seldom have an applicant from single persons; but I believe they earn on the average 4*s.* a day; if they are buttonhole hands they earn a very fair wage.

171. Lord

171. Lord *Monkswell.*] What ages would they be?
They would be adults; 16 and 17 to 18 years of age, because the younger workers would not be useful to them, because they could not do the amount of work.

172. Earl of *Limerick.*] You are alluding to the skilled labour, as I understand, not to the inferior classes of labour; this is rather a higher class that you are speaking of?
I have taken it from the slop trade; but the average earnings would be from about 4*s.* to 8*s.* a day.

173. *Chairman.*] These are the families which apply for relief?
Yes.

174. All working in the same trade and the same shop?
No, not working in the same shop.

175. Lord *Thring.*] The cases you are putting are under the Factory Law; but can you tell us about the cases where members of a family work together, and therefore are not under the Factory Law; is that common?
That is common.

176. Because the cases you have put are cases under the Factory Law?
I have taken those cases specially in order to point out that there is not the proper supervision.

177. But that is the factory inspector's fault, not the sanitary inspector's?
I think it is both.

178. The cases you gave were of workshops under the Factory Law; I wished to know whether you could give us any evidence also as to domestic workshops in which the factory inspector does not enter, because only members of the same family are employed; can you tell us whether that description of work goes on very much?
Yes, it does; cases in which the head of the family, the father, might employ his grown-up children.

179. How are they paid; do they earn as much, for instance, as the persons you have been speaking of?
They would earn together more.

180. And are they, in your opinion, in a worse condition or a better condition than what I will call the factory workshops?
They are in a worse condition, because they do their work in their own homes, in what is generally a sleeping apartment.

181. True; and do they work longer hours, as far as you know; take the case of a father with his children?
I do not think they would. From my knowledge of the poor, if they were not compelled to work the very long hours they do, they would not do it, and I do not think that a father would do that.

182. Take a father with a child, we will say of 13, working together; in your opinion would that child be worked 12 or 14 hours a day?
Yes; but I do not think he would be worked longer than that; say 12 hours, allowing the usual time for meals. I do not think that a man would work with his family for so long a time during the day in his own house as he would be obliged to do in the various workshops.

183. Let me put it in another way. You are aware that with regard to a child in a factory workshop the master is punishable if he overworks that child?
Quite so.

184. In a domestic workshop the law does not get at the child or affect the child practically. Do you think from your great knowledge of Jewish workshops that these domestic worshops are in a very much worse condition than the factory shops?
I do not think they are in a worse condition.

185. You do not think that the father, or whoever employs them, is generally cruel to the children?
No, I do not think so.

186. *Chairman.*] In these cases which you mention, I understand from you the persons applied for relief owing to being temporarily out of work?
Quite so.

187. And in all probability they would again obtain work and be able to repay advances made to them?
Not to us. Temporary assistance we should not look upon as a loan.

188. Have you any idea as to the cause of their being temporarily out of work?
Just at this season of the year the manufacturing trades, more especially the boot and the tailoring trades, are certainly slack. This season, for instance, the weather is bad; the merchants will not make up their summer clothing so soon.

189. What is, roughly speaking, the slack time in the year?
The slack time is January and February.

190. Only two months of the year?
Yes, of what you may call a very bad time.

191. Men are generally in good work during the other 10 months?
Yes.

192. And that slackness is owing to entirely natural causes?
The natural course of events.

193. You do not think that the employers endeavour to crowd a great deal of work into a short space of time for their own benefit?
I have no means of knowing that?

194. Earl of *Limerick.*] How many days weekly do the Jewish workmen generally work?
They generally work in the winter, if they can obtain employment, on the Sunday; that would be 5½ days, because they would leave off work at from half-past 3 to 4 o'clock on Friday afternoon (the Sabbath commences at sunset), and they would certainly not work longer than 5½ days.

195. Lord *Rothschild.*] And that would only be if they could get work on Sunday?
If they could get work on Sunday.

196. Earl of *Limerick.*] Otherwise it would be only 4½ days a week?
Otherwise it would be only 4½ days.

197. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] You said just now that the contract system was dying out?
Yes; that is stated from information I have received.

198. Did you mean that there were fewer middle-men now interposed between the great employers and the sweaters, or in what way is the contract system dying out?
The contract system is dying out in this way, that formerly a contractor would take a very large quantity of work from the merchant, and then let it out again to the sweaters; but now the sweater goes direct to the merchant and obtains his work.

199. The sweater himself. The middle-men are fewer, in fact?
Yes, the middle-men are fewer.

200. Is that to the advantage of the sweaters or not?
It would be to the advantage of the sweaters, because there would not be one profit wasted.

201. Fewer profits to come off?
Yes, quite so.

202. Then

202. Then are the sweaters getting to be larger men, men of more means?
I think their condition would improve under that system.

203. *Chairman.*] Do you know into how many divisions this cheap tailoring trade is divided, how many distinct divisions there are in the making of a suit of clothes, such as pressers and button-holers, I mean?
There would be the machinist, the presser, and sometimes a baster; but if a man is a good workman he will be the baster and presser together. Then there is the button-hole maker and the finisher; there is the person who fells the coat and finishes.

204. Which of those would be conducted by females?
The finishing and felling.

205. And it would be necessary, I suppose, that they should keep pace with the other workpeople?
Quite so.

206. Have you any idea what the general rate of wages is. Among the cases you gave us you mentioned one man who was earning 6 *s.* a day, another who could earn 8 *s.* a day at piecework; have you any idea what the general rate of wages is?
I should think the average, according to the class of work, from 4 *s.* per day to 8 *s.* per day; that is for the male labour.

207. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] And the girls?
I am informed that a good button-hole hand could earn at least 4 *s.* per day; that is for the better class of work; but I have the case of one female on my notes, and from the evidence I took, she did not fare so well. She was a widow; she said she was a tailoress; she was doing the binding and felling; she received 2½ *d.* per coat, and had to provide her own cottons and silks.

208. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] How long would it take her to finish the work on a coat?
She said she could do one dozen per day; she could earn 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a day at it.

209. By a long day's work?
She said a fair day; having to attend to her domestic duties also.

210. *Chairman.*] Do you consider that you are brought in contact with the greatest poverty, and the lowest kind of wages; in fact, generally with the people who are worse circumstanced?
Certainly; otherwise they would not apply to our institution.

211. But you have mentioned two cases of men who were earning 6 *s.* and 8 *s.* per day who applied to you?
Yes; that is 6 *s.* to 8 *s.* a day when they had work; but they would not have continual work at that rate. If a man were to have three-and-a-half days a week, as the work goes, he would consider himself fairly paid. Taking a good man it would bring his wages up to 25 *s.* to 28 *s.* per week.

212. Lord *Thring.*] What would you call unskilled labour in tailoring as distinguished from skilled labour; or would you make any distinction?
Yes; I think the unskilled labour is that of a person who has not been very long in the trade; he would be employed in the very commonest work.

213. What would that be?
Machining.

214. By "machining" you mean sewing?
Machine-sewing.

215. What would he or she earn at machine-sewing a day?
I do not suppose that a man would earn more than 4 *s.* a day.

216. And a woman, how much?
They are generally young women that work at the machine work. I could not

not say their earnings, because we very seldom have an application from a single person.

217. Cannot you guess it pretty closely?
I should think she would be able to earn quite as much as the man. It is all according to the rate of speed they can go.

218. *Chairman.*] In any case I suppose that would be subject to the same condition of say, three days a week for work?
Yes.

219. So that taking their wage-earning capacity, you would have to reckon half the wages; if a man is earning 6*s.* or 4*s.* a day that must be considered as extending over three days a week?
A little better than three days a week, I should take it, on the average.

220. A man earning 8*s.* a day would be making somewhere about 21*s.* a week?
It would be more than that; it would be better than the half.

221. Have you any idea what his rent would be, and general expenses of that kind?
His rent would average about 4*s.* to 5*s.*, or 5*s.* 6*d.* a week.

222. Himself and his family?
Yes.

223. Lord *Thring.*] But why if he is a skilled workman can he not get work every day?
At some season of the year a man would have work the whole of the week. As I said before when he is in full work he is able to pull himself up from the bad times.

224. *Chairman.*] What I do not clearly understand is this: if, as you say, the slack time consists of only two months in the year, and if a man is earning say 25 *s.* a week for 10 months in the year, I do not clearly understand what should have brought him to you for relief?
Two months is rather a long period for a man to be out of work. During the rest of the year he would be only earning perhaps enough to keep himself from week to week, and meet other emergencies. It would be considered a fair case for relief being out of work for two months.

225. Earl of *Derby.*] I should like to put this to you generally; in your experience are you acquainted with any case where the wages paid are not sufficient for decent men to live upon?
I cannot say that I have had many cases brought under my notice, but there are some persons who, as I said, are employed in what is termed the second-hand clothing, and that work is paid very badly. They make up from second-hand garments; they are remade; the Government stores are bought up, and the clothing is remade. In that part of the trade the wages are very low indeed.

226. Earl of *Onslow.*] In Mr. Burnett's Report he mentions the case of a woman engaged in making vests, who could not earn "5 *s.* a week, even by working from 7 a.m. to 12 or 1 a.m,, and sometimes sat up till 4 in the morning to finish work," while another, "in good trade can make 2 *s.* a day." Would you consider that an exaggeration?
I imagine that that is an isolated case.

227. In another place he mentions a sub-sweater who makes knickerbockers at 1½ *d.* a pair, and can earn 5 *s.* 6 *d.* a week; would that be another isolated case?
I should think so.

228. And another who "makes children's suits, coats and knickers for 4½ *d.*, and 2 *d.* for finishing, but has cotton to find;" all those would be isolated cases, in your opinion?
Yes, I should think so.

229. Earl

229. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] When you speak of bad wages, what sort of wages per day do you consider low wages?
I should say 3 *s.* to 3 *s.* 6 *d.* a day for a man at work a very long number of hours in the second-hand clothing.

230. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] Does the second-hand clothing employ a great number of people?
No.

231. Lord *Thring.*] Why is the second-hand clothing, in your opinion, worse paid; is it because it requires less skill?
Because the things are sold much cheaper.

232. Is the work required to be done in second-hand clothing more or less skilled than the work required to be done in first?
Certainly less skilled.

233. Earl of *Onslow.*] Have you noticed amongst those of your co-religionists who have been engaged for some years in this trade any deterioration in their physical appearance and health?
Only as regards the pressers, because that is of course the laborious part of the work.

234. Are they as a rule long-lived?
I think they live the average time; but they get into a bad state of health.

235. You are now speaking of the pressers only?
I am speaking of the pressers' work, which is the worst part of the trade, because it is very laborious. They have to work with a very heavy iron which is hot, and which is worked across a damp rag, and the steam from that, and the constant pressing with the chest is certainly injurious; and I find that unless a man has a very good physique he will, after a certain number of years, break down under it.

236. Do you not find that apply to the machinists and button-holers?
Not so much.

237. It has been said that in former years, before the sweating system reached the present pitch, the morality among the female Jews was very good indeed, and that since then it has considerably deteriorated, and is much lower now than it was a few years ago; is that within your experience?
I should not like to say so. I do not think that the immorality amongst the Jewish girls has increased to any very great extent.

238. You do not think that the sweating system has in any way tended to to produce that result?
No, I do not.

239. *Chairman.*] Do you mean that you do not consider that the circumstance of men and women working together and so on produces immorality?
Not to any great extent, because I should certainly hear of it in the course of time, because most of these young people are connected with the poorer class, and I should know it in the course of information that we gain from time to time.

240. I suppose you have read Mr. Burnett's Report carefully?
I have.

241. Generally speaking, do you think that he has gathered rather an exaggerated impression of the condition of the trade?
I think, taking it as a report altogether, I should say it was fair, because no doubt in taking up cases, as I said before, in this knickerbocker line, there might be an isolated bad case here and there. Taking his report in general, I think it is fair, more particularly as it gives a most correct account as to the way in which the work is carried on, and the defects in the sanitary arrangements. I think, taking it as a report, it is fair.

242. Earl of *Onslow.*] You do not agree with this statement in Mr. Burnett's report; "Dr. Hermann Adler sorrowfully admits that the social evil now prevails in the Jewish community which had always been free from it before, until the continual influx of foreign Jewesses unable to find work, caused many to be driven on to the streets"?

I am very sorry to differ; I have seen that statement before and I do not agree with it.

243. *Chairman.*] Do you consider that if the existing Factory Acts and Sanitary Acts were properly applied, a sufficient remedy would be found for the existing sanitary evils, and the evil of over-work, that that would have all the necessary effect?

I think so as to the former, but of course as for over-work it would not apply to that; as far as men are concerned it would not apply.

244. But if a woman were not allowed to work beyond proper hours, is it not a fact that the men would of necessity not be able to work longer hours?

No doubt it would have a very great effect in preventing their doing so.

245. In your own opinion, is there any fresh legislation necessary?

I do not think any fresh legislation is necessary. As I said before, more power should be given to the factory inspector in respect to sanitation.

246. You think rather that the two functions should be combined?

Yes.

247. Earl of *Onslow.*] Do you mean in respect to sanitation?

Yes.

248. Because he has no power as regards sanitation at present?

I know that.

249. *Chairman.*] Have you formed any opinion at all as to what effect any further legislative interference or any better application of the existing law would have upon the general trade, whether the trade would be injuriously affected?

I have a note here that I have no special knowledge of the recent alleged reduction in the wages paid to the sweaters. No doubt your Lordships will have read that the Government pay only (I think it is) 12 *s.* 6 *d.* for a whole suit of clothes, and 10 *s.* 4½ *d.* for corduroys. Merchants pay corresponding sums for clothes for exportation; of these only the coats are made, as I said before, by Jews.

250. What I rather wanted to gather from you is whether any fresh legislation, or the existing Factory Acts and Sanitary Acts being properly carried out, would have any effect in making the production dearer; whether the trade would be damaged?

That is a very broad question.

251. It is a very important one?

It is a very important one.

252. Earl of *Limerick.*] I understood you to say that you thought Section 61 of the Factory Act, giving power to the inspector to enter, should be made to apply to certain classes of small workshops to which it does not now apply?

Yes, quite so; I think that is quite necessary.

253. *Chairman.*] Do you know whether competition on the part of small employers in the trade has become very severe?

I think it has, and you find that in all trades.

254. Not more so in this than others?

Not more so in this; more especially in the cabinet-making trade.

255. Is there great competition between London and provincial towns?

Yes.

256. What do you think the effect of that is?

The effect is this: I find that in provincial towns they are starting large manufactories.

257. Is

257. Is the tendency of the trade to leave London for the provinces?
I do not think there is an exact tendency in that direction, but of late there have been large factories started in the provinces.

258. And there is great competition among the workmen, I suppose?
No doubt.

259. Lord *Thring.*] Comparing London with Liverpool and Manchester, are you able to say whether the same things go on in Liverpool and Manchester and other great towns, or are they confined to London?
I do not think that trade is so bad in the provinces, gathering from the reports, that trade is so congested I should say.

260. Earl of *Onslow.*] Do you know anything of Newcastle?
No.

261. You are not aware that a public meeting has been held there recently on the subject?
No, I am not.

262. *Chairman.*] Is there not a great deal of this trade at Leeds?
At Leeds, and at Stroud in Gloucestershire.

263. How is the condition there compared with London?
At Stroud it is something new, not been established very long. The report I hear from there is that things are not so bad.

264. Earl of *Limerick.*] Is that generally factory work or work in other workshops?
Generally factory work.

265. Lord *Monkswell.*] Can you say anything about Liverpool?
No.

266. The Amalgamated Society of Tailors state that the system of trade is very bad there; you do not know that?
No, I do not.

267. *Chairman.*] Do you think the Committee could get any approximate idea of the relative increase or decrease of foreign immigration by the statistics of the number of children educated in the various Jewish schools?
Yes, I think that could be done.

268. Could you furnish us with those figures?
We have no direct communication with the various schools.

269. How is the Jewish Board of Guardians supported?
By voluntary contributions.

270. A large number of subscribers?
Yes, we have a very large number of subscribers.

271. Do you know whether many of the employers, master tailors and so on, are subscribers to the association?
We have some; not to a very great extent, but we have some.

272. Is there any kind of organisation among the working people for helping each other; anything in the nature of a trades union?
No. There are of course various benefit clubs.

273. Lord *Rothschild.*] You consider that they are minor synagogues?
Yes.

274. And when foreign Jews arrive in this country, they first of all apply to their relatives and to their minor synagogues before coming to you?
Yes, or generally to their people of the same town that they come from.

275. And it is only after they have exhausted all these resources that they would come to you?
Yes.

276. They in most cases come to you to return them to their native land or to send them on to America, or elsewhere?
That is if they have been unsuccessful here.

277. If they are successful they do not come to you at all?
No.

278. I suppose you could obtain the number of foreign children who entered the different Jewish schools, from the schoolmasters, for the last 10 years?
No doubt we could.

279. Perhaps you would obtain that information for the last 10 years?
I will.

280. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] There is a statement quoted at page 19 of your Report for 1887, that immigrants are also on arriving "able to give their services free for a short time until they become more or less efficient at their work;" is that a common case?
It is not a common case.

281. I think you said this morning that you did not know any instance of people coming to work for nothing?
Not any instance that has come directly under my knowledge, I should say.

282. But that does go on?
Well, to a very small extent; I should think very small indeed. Then it would not be the head of a family; it would be perhaps a single man that would do that.

283. You do not think that there are people either here or abroad who engage numbers of people to do that?
I do not.

284. Neither here nor abroad?
Neither here nor abroad; that has not come to my knowledge. I have made a search for it in many of the foreign papers.

285. Lord *Thring.*] In answer to Lord Rothschild you said, as I understand it, that you do not come in contact, as a general rule, with the Jewish immigrants at their first coming to England?
Not when they first arrive here.

286. Consequently you do not, as a general rule, know whether they arrive in good or bad condition?
That is only from the information I should receive, and a general knowledge of them.

287. But that knowledge you acquire, as I understand it, not on their first coming, but after an interval; they go to a lower or subordinate congregation or synagogue?
They would apply to their townspeople, who are ever ready to assist them; and after they have exhausted their friends and have been here a certain time, they would eventually apply to us.

288. But still you do not arrive at a knowledge of their primary condition so to speak, when they come to England?
Not directly they arrive here; we should not come in contact with them then.

289. But indirectly you think you have arrived at that knowledge?
Indirectly; that is from our outdoor officers. They would know they come across people in their investigations.

290. Therefore you still adhere to your statement that, as a general rule, when the Jews come to England they are not in a state of pauperism?
Not in a state of pauperism.

291. Earl of *Onslow.*] Are you aware that in the United States no person is allowed to land who is unable to take care of himself without becoming a public charge?
Yes.

292. Would you say that the majority of the Jews who land in England would come within that description?
The majority certainly would.

293. The

293. The majority, you think, would be allowed to land in America under those conditions?
Under those conditions.

294. Earl of *Limerick.*] Do you know the class of lodging-houses to which they go on first landing?
Yes; they are very small lodging-houses; some of them are certified, some are not; most of them are certified; what they call small restaurants.

295. Has any arrangement been made between the employers and sweaters and the keepers of those lodging-houses as regards men being supplied with work, or obtaining men to work at low rates?
Such a system has never come under my knowledge.

296. You have not heard of it?
No.

297. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] Do you know any women who work on their own account who belong to benefit clubs?
I do not.

298. Earl of *Limerick.*] Do you know anything of the work done for dressmakers; has any of that work come under your knowledge?
No, I know very few indeed of those persons; I think the dressmaking is much better paid.

299. You are not prepared to speak as to that?
I am not prepared to speak as to that.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. CHARLES BOOTH, having been called in; is Examined, as follows:

300. *Chairman.*] You are conducting an inquiry, are you not, into the general condition and occupations of the people in the Tower Hamlets?
Yes, the whole East End.

301. Are you conducting that inquiry for your own pleasure?
Yes, in connection with the Statistical Society, of which I am a fellow; that is to say, my object is to do it for the Journal of the Society.

302. I mean, is it a voluntary occupation on your own part, or is there any obligation on you to do it?
Entirely voluntary.

303. In the course of that inquiry, have you come in contact with what is commonly known as the sweating system?
Yes.

304. Can you give the Committee a general idea of what you have gathered as to the sweating system, and the condition of the trade, and those employed in it?
I hardly can, my inquiry is so very incomplete.

305. When do you think you will have finished that inquiry?
I think within six months.

306. Can you give the Committee any information relative to the subject of their inquiry?
I should prefer to attempt to answer any questions which the Committee may put to me.

307. You have furnished a memorandum to a noble Lord, a member of the Committee; have you any objection to that memorandum being put in?
None whatever. I may say it is with reference to provincial competition. This is the memorandum I have drawn up: "There are indications that the bad condition of many London industries is connected with provincial com-

 petition,

petition, and that while the tendency of population has been towards London, there has been a movement of trade from London. It is, of course, not suggested that population flows to London from those provincial districts which successfully compete with London in manufacturing; on the contrary, the increase of population in such districts has been more rapid than in London. The competition is mainly that of large factories in the provinces, with small workshops or home industry in London, but it extends to that of provincial factories with London factories, and provincial home industry with London home industry. It may be taken for granted that the general conditions of life in the provinces are more healthful than at the East End of London; and there seems to be evidence that the factory system, with its better sanitary condition and greater regularity of earnings, is beating the 'Sweating System' in those provincial towns such as Leeds, where both methods of manufacture exist. On the other hand, the tendency in London is distinctly against large factories, and in favour of home work and small workshops. The economy effected under the factory system, by a more extensive use of machinery, and by more highly-organised and regular employment, seems in London to be replaced by the detailed pressure of wholesale houses, or middlemen acting for them on master tailors, who transmit this pressure to those working under them, masters and men suffering alike from the long hours, insanitary conditions, and irregular earnings characteristic of the East End workshop. This method of production, apparently most suited to the habits and character of the people (that is to say, the people of London), stands out as the economic stronghold of London manufacture, and is popularly known as the 'Sweating System.' It therefore becomes a point for consideration whether the troubles experienced in London are not partly caused by a transfer of certain trades to the provinces, which might be ultimately beneficial considered nationally. As applied more particularly to the clothing trades, it is asserted by the wholesale dealers in men's clothing and in boots and shoes, that provincial production is superior in cheapness and quality of work in all ready-made stock goods. On the other hand, it is admitted that London not only monopolises the production of hand-sewn goods (a very small proportion of these trades entirely in the hands of skilled mechanics earning high wages), but supplies all goods made to order for the middle and working-class customers of London. The provinces cannot compete owing to their distance, and for the further reason that the factory system is not adapted to the carrying out of special orders. The vitality of these London trades is therefore in a great degree dependent on the relative growth of stock and bespoke work. In the tailoring industry only is there any ground for supposing that the bespoke may be gaining on the ready-made trade, and we" (that is to say, I and those who are working with me) "have not yet found any definite conclusions on this point. The inquiry into the conditions of life and industry in East London, upon which we are engaged, is not yet complete enough to enable us to speak with full confidence or sufficient proof, but the views here suggested are perhaps worth consideration and investigation at the hands of your Lordships' Committee. The points we would suggest for special inquiry are, (*a*) Is the proportion of work executed in the Provinces (on behalf of London wholesale or retail houses) increasing? (*b*) Dividing the trade into (1) Bespoke, (2) Stock (Home and Export), what class of work leaves London, and why? (*c*) Sub-dividing 'Stock' into ordinary and slop for the home-trade, and into various grades for the export trade, according to quality and price, and with special reference to the destination, what class of production is declining in London? This information is hardly within the reach of any private inquiries, but could be obtained by your Lordships from the wholesale houses."

308. Lord *Thring*.] In order to arrive at all this information, no doubt you must have had a considerable knowledge of the sweating system; will you tell us what is the sweating system, in your opinion?

I think it is an abuse.

309. Will you tell us what it is?

Do you want a definition?

310. Yes.

310. Yes. The former witness says it is a system of contract and sub-contract; do you agree?
I think it is an abuse of that system.

311. Tell us what you consider the sweating system to be?
I think it to be an abuse of the contract system. I do not think it is the contract system. The contract system applies almost throughout the industry in England; and to say that the whole contract system was the sweating system, would be to go very far. And I do not see that sweating is a system; it appears to me to be an abuse of a system.

312. You do not think it admits of a definition. Then what is the sweating system in your opinion?
I think it is a picturesque description of an abuse. I will try to define it in this way: the advantage that may be taken of unskilled and unorganized labour under the contract system.

313. Then do you consider that the sweaters do oppress the unskilled labour?
I should prefer not to answer that question. I cannot answer questions of that sort without committing myself to a view which I have not yet in my own mind committed myself to in any way.

314. Can you tell us what the wages are in the tailoring trade?
My evidence as to that is chiefly that of Mr. Burnett; I have some additional evidence.

315. But can you tell us whether in the tailoring trade there are persons that are earning extremely miserable wages, and, if so, what are those miserable wages?
I have had instances of very low wages.

316. Will you be good enough to tell us some?
I have heard of an instance of a woman making coats for 7 *d.* each, and I was informed that she could make of these coats four in a day. She worked by herself; she was her own machiner, and did all the work, excepting the buttonholes, for which she paid 1 *d.* out of the 7 *d.*

317. You say you have heard of that; I am obliged to press you a little more; do you know it of your own knowledge, or is it mere rumour?
The knowledge came through my secretary who visited the person.

318. Did your secretary know it of his own knowledge?
Only so far as he was told so by the person herself. Of course, my object is to verify these things; I have not yet verified them.

319. Earl of *Onslow.*] Did you not make a special inquiry into the condition of the district of the Tower Hamlets, the Tower Hamlets School Board Division?
I did.

320. And you wrote an article upon it, or read a paper upon it?
Yes.

321. Therefore you have had some opportunity of forming opinions, have you not?
Yes, I have been working at the subject some time.

322. Where did your inquiry chiefly lie?
I have extended it from the Tower Hamlets to the rest of the East End. I am now completing it in the whole of the East End.

323. But you have made an inquiry specially into the district of the Tower Hamlets?
Yes.

324. Is it not the fact that in the district of the Tower Hamlets is included almost the whole of that part of the East End of London which is principally inhabited by the poor Jews engaged in the sweating trades?
Yes.

 325. Therefore,

325. Therefore, you have had some opportunity of learning their condition in the course of that inquiry?

Yes; but that portion of the subject, the tailoring trade, I left for a special inquiry to be conducted afterwards, which we are now doing.

326. But when you made your inquiry, did you not specially devote a portion of your report to the sweating system?

I have treated it in a paragraph stating that the subject was too large to be dealt with there; and I am now attempting to deal with it properly.

327. But is it your opinion that the persons who are employed in the sweating trades would be capable of being employed in any other trade more skilled?

I should suppose they might be.

328. Although they have no knowledge of any other trade?

I do not think that they have any special inaptitude. No man is moved very easily from one trade to another.

329. *Chairman.*] Have you any personal experience at all on the sweating system?

Hardly. The experience is mainly that got by my secretary. This branch of the work I have not done much myself; I have seen a few men.

330. Have you ever been into the houses of these people?

None of them.

331. Lord *Thring.*] Do you know the number of Jews, for instance, employed in the sweating trades generally?

I think that the number, as stated by Mr. Burnett, is slightly over estimated; that was my opinion when I looked into it; but his is better information than any I could give you.

332. Earl of *Derby.*] I understood you to say that the sweating system, in your judgment, is an abuse created by the system of employing unskilled labour under contract, whereby an undue advantage is taken of the labourer?

Yes, I think so.

333. Will you say what the undue advantage taken is?

I did not say positively that any undue advantage was taken.

334. You have spoken of the very low wages paid in that business?

Yes.

335. Do I understand you to say that those wages are lower than for the worst of the work done in the open market?

No, I do not think I should say that; I do not know how to answer that.

336. Should you say that these people who are paid very low wages are paid less than their labour is worth; or is the complaint really that their labour is worth no more?

I should put it in the second way, that it probably is worth no more, but I do not know.

337. Lord *Thring.*] Then in your opinion they earn fair wages, using "fair" in the sense that they earn what their labour is worth?

I think the difficulty of their earnings lies far more in the irregularity of their work than in the nominal amount of their pay.

338. Then you think that they do earn fair wages in the sense that they earn what their labour is worth?

I feel it so very difficult to answer that. What exactly do you mean by unfair wages?

339. I call a thing unfair when a man takes undue advantage of the inability of a man to get work, and pays him less than the market value of his work?

What is the market value, except what he can get.

340. That may be; but there may be unfair wages owing to strangers coming

coming over and being unfairly caught before they understand the proper labour market; I should call that unfair; a system analogous to the crimping system for seamen. I will put it in another way: we are told that these Polish Jews are brought over here, and that immediately they land in London, before they have had any opportunity of ascertaining the state of the labour market, or applying to their friends, they are caught up and inveigled into contracts for labour which is unfairly paid?

I should not think that the effect of the new comers was very great.

341. *Chairman.*] If I understand you, the only opinion you can give is founded on second-hand evidence, that of your secretary?

Yes.

342. Then how do you arrive at the conclusions that you set forward in this memorandum?

I have myself seen several of the wholesale men, and talked to them.

343. You say in your memorandum that "there are indications that the bad condition of many London industries is connected with provincial competition"; do they include among them the cheap tailoring trade?

Yes.

344. What are your reasons for arriving at that conclusion?

Statements that have been made to me by the wholesale houses.

345. And you also say that "it may be taken for granted that the general conditions of life in the provinces are more healthful than at the East End of London, and there seems to be evidence that the factory system, with its better sanitary condition and greater regularity of earnings, is beating the sweating system in those provincial towns"; is that founded upon your own observation?

It is founded again upon what I have been informed by the wholesale houses.

346. You gave some information as to the number of Jews in the East End of London, in a Table before the Statistical Society, last June?

Yes.

347. That, I suppose, is founded upon your own knowledge?

That is founded on a proportion based upon the number of Jew parents of children in the elementary schools.

348. I see you say there, "The best estimate I can make myself, gives a total of fully 40,000 Jews in the Tower Hamlets; and as Bethnal Green must contain a considerable number, I get about 45,000 as the total of East End Jews;" do you consider that an accurate estimate?

It is as accurate as I can make it, on the information which I have.

349. Does that information enable you to judge whether the immigration of Jews is increasing or decreasing?

It does not; because, as I took only that one time, it does not deal with the increase or decrease.

350. This was a paper read last June; when did you gain the information?

On the previous six months chiefly.

351. That would only refer then to last year?

Yes. I began the work a year before, but most of it was done six months before I read the paper.

352. Could you obtain information from the same sources as to the number of Jews five years ago?

No, because of the method in which it was done. The method was that of going through the books of the School Board Visitors, book by book; the whole of the inquiry could not be done again, going back five years; the books do not exist.

353. They did not keep any, do you mean?

No, I do not say that; but it would be much the same work again; but I doubt

doubt whether the books would be in existence, and the same visitors would not be now employed; it would be practically impossible to pursue the same method of inquiry for the past. The method of inquiry was that each of the School Board Visitors came before my secretary in turn with his books, and went street by street through this district, indicating who and what were the parents of the children who went to school. From that I made my schedule, and from those schedules the figures are taken.

354. And you think that system could not be applied to the year 1880?
No; but, on the other hand, we have for 1881 the Census figures, which are very much better than anything that I could produce.

355. How do they compare with yours?
There is a considerable increase shown. Between 1881, when the Census was taken, and 1886–87, when my figures were taken, there is a considerable increase shown in the number of Jews, which undoubtedly exists.

356. Lord *Rothschild.*] There is nothing in the census to show the religion of anybody?
Your Lordship is right. I thought the figure could have been got from the census, but I was in error.

357. *Chairman.*] Have you any opinion of your own whether the numbers are increasing?
The numbers have increased. There has been a large immigration of Jews into the East End of London. Whether it is now going on or increasing I am not able to say.

358. Do you think that that has had any effect in producing the evils attributed to the sweating system?
Some.

359. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] Is there a large emigration of Jews also?
I am informed so; but my information, again, you have had first hand from Mr. Stephany.

360. Lord *Thring.*] Did you hear Mr. Stephany's evidence?
I did not.

361. Earl of *Onslow*] Is it a fact that the Russian Poles are forming a very large section of the population at the East End?
In Whitechapel they are a very large proportion.

362. And most of them are employed in the cheap tailoring trade, are they not?
Yes.

363. In what condition do they land in this country?
I can give you no information except second hand as to that.

364. Do you know at all whether they are encouraged to come to this country?
I have often had conversations with Mr. Stephany, and his information is all I can give you. He says not.

365. You are aware that there is an institution existing called the Jewish Board of Guardians?
Yes.

366. Do you think that the existence of such a body, and the knowledge that such a body exists, tends to increase the number who come over to this country?
I should not think so.

367. Do you think that the knowledge that they were likely to be helped would deter them from coming?
I think the Jewish Board of Guardians take special pains to prevent that.

368. You

368. You do not think that the knowledge of that bounty tends to increase the number who come into this country?

In itself the existence of the bounty must. If you had no bounty the people would die, of course; but I do not think that the organisation called the Jewish Board of Guardians, as an organisation, has had that effect.

369. Then you have altered your opinion considerably since you read your paper?

What did I say in my paper?

370. What I read just now. You say here, "They arrive destitute, often without the knowledge of any trade, and for a long time they know no language but their own. They naturally resort to the quarters already occupied by those speaking the same language, and, perhaps, hailing from the same districts abroad, or connected by relationship or acquaintance. Their compatriots are hardly better off than themselves, and can only share with the new-comers their wretched accommodation and ill-paid work. The result is an aggravation of every evil; the condition of the houses becomes indescribable, and the slavery of the sweating system is intensified. The numbers now arriving are less than they have been, but certain districts are overrun, and the effect has been to flood many established trades with unhealthy cheap labour. Miserably destitute themselves, they also increase the destitution of their own people and of our own people. The Jewish Board are fully cognisant of this deplorable state of things, and have made great exertions to check the influx and to send back, or send further, those who come. The great weight of the evil falls on them and on their people. The poor Jews rarely apply to our guardians except for medical relief, and the Charity Organisation Society hands over to the Board all Jewish cases. The total amount given, in one form or other, by rich Jews to their poor brethren is very large, and it is worthy of serious consideration (both by Jews and Christians) whether such bounty" (that is, the bounty given by the Jewish Board of Guardians) "does not tend to increase the numbers of those it aids to live." I want to know whether you hold the same opinion now?

Yes, I hold the same opinion; I do not think that the organisation of that bounty has had that effect.

371. Lord *Thring*.] I see in this statement you have put in, you draw a distinction, as I understand it, between factory work and what we call home work; is not that so?

Yes.

372. And you say, as I understand it, that factory work is more beneficial than home work?

It is under much better sanitary regulations.

373. But with respect to this particular work of tailoring, bespoke work, how can it be carried on under factory regulations?

The bespoke work cannot.

374. Therefore the bespoke work must be necessarily domestic work?

I think so.

375. Therefore you do not accuse the sweating tailors, as I understand it, of unnecessarily pressing their work, because it is necessary; it is an incident of the case; you must have this domestic work, such as the sweating tailors carry on, in order to produce the article, is that so?

Yes, you must have the workshop system, I think, to produce bespoke goods.

376. Earl of *Derby*.] As the result of your inquiries, do you consider that the great poverty and the low wages which undoubtedly prevail in the East End are due to artificial causes, or simply to the state of the market, and to the demand for employment being greater than the supply; do you think that that state of things is due to any artificial exceptional cause?

To no important extent.

377. Not to any unfair advantage taken by the employers?
I do not know how to define an "unfair advantage"; I do not know quite what is meant.

378. I will put it in another way. Is it alleged that any of these people who are working, or who are said to be working, for very inadequate wages have been induced to do so by engaging in contracts of the meaning of which they were not aware?
No information that I personally have is of that character.

379. Lord *Thring.*] But is it your opinion that it is so?
I have not an opinion. I may perhaps say, as to the case to which I referred a short time ago of the woman who was doing these very cheap coats, she got her work direct from the wholesale house; there was no intermediate person of any kind, and so I should doubt whether she could be described as being "sweated."

380. Then you do not think that she was unfairly dealt with?
I do not say that; but she had no employer of the nature of what is called a sweater.

381. But putting your own interpretation on fair or unfair, do you think that woman was fairly dealt with?
I think it was a hard bargain.

382. Do you think she was fairly dealt with?
I cannot answer that.

383. *Chairman.*] Have you any personal knowledge of these people who are sweated; sweatees as we call them?
I have met some of the Jewish branch of the Amalgamated Tailors.

384. I am talking of the workpeople?
They are workpeople; I have heard their story.

385. And with regard to the information that you have gathered, part of which you embodied in that paper read at the Statistical Society, and part of which is in this memorandum you have put in to-day, has that been gathered by your own personal knowledge?
Partly.

386. And partly second-hand?
Partly my secretary's.

387. Lord *Thring.*] But you have confidence in your secretary, I presume?
Perfect.

388. Therefore, you believe, in effect, that everything that your secretary says is true?
Yes.

389. Practically, that is your information?
My difficulty is this; that I feel the facts I have got need some investigation and confirmation, and I should be very sorry to commit myself to an opinion which I might a few months hence have to change. The very fact that now I have to stand to the very imperfect statements I made a year ago, when I knew that I was quite at the beginning, at the threshold of this inquiry, makes it more difficult for me to speak now, when I am perhaps one-third through.

390. Earl of *Limerick.*] I suppose the Amalgamated Tailors only represent the more skilled and higher paid men, not the immigrants?
This particular society, the Jewish branch, represents some very poor, not highly paid. Their whole numbers, I think, are not more than 60, and they would not be, any of them, new arrivals.

391. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] You are not prepared to say that unfair advantage is taken by the sweaters of the destitute condition of the people.
I am not prepared to express an opinion.

392. Are

392. Are you prepared to say that you think there are any curable evils pressing upon that class of people called sweatees ?
I should not be prepared to speak on that subject.

393. Nor to suggest any remedies ?
No.

394. Earl of *Limerick.*] Have you inquired into the state of the workshops ?
No; not at all.

395. Or into the state of the houses in which they reside ?
No; not beyond the information which was given me by the School Board Visitors; I asked them about it.

396. Lord *Thring.*] What did they say ?
They described it in very black colours, many of them.

397. *Chairman.*] In fact, I gather that you consider that your inquiries are as yet so imperfect that you have not arrived at any definite conclusion as to whether any evil exists at all, and if so, as to what the remedy is ?
I should rather say that I have not arrived at any definite conclusion as to the nature of the evil. There is a *primâ facie* evil.

398. But you do not know the nature of the evil ?
No.

399. And therefore you are unable to suggest any remedies
Yes.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Friday, the 13th April, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Veneris, 13° *Aprilis*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of CANTERBURY.
Earl of DERBY.
Earl of ONSLOW.
Lord CLINTON.
Lord CLIFFORD of CHUDLEIGH.
Lord FOXFORD (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord ROTHSCHILD.
Lord THRING.

LORD KENRY (EARL OF DUNRAVEN AND MOUNT-EARL), IN THE CHAIR.

MR. ARNOLD HENRY WHITE, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

400. *Chairman.*] YOU are much interested, are you not, in what are commonly known as social questions?
Yes.

401. You have lately published a book called "Problems of a Great City," dealing with them?
Yes, two years ago.

402. And your investigations have been conducted, have they not, mainly in the East End of London?
Yes, exclusively.

403. Have you come in contact therefore with what is commonly known as the Sweating System?
I have.

404. How do you define the Sweating System?
I think it is impossible to give a scientific definition of the term, but it involves three ideas, which are sufficiently distinct. The broadest definition that I can give of a sweater is, one who grinds the face of the poor; the second is that of a man who contributes neither capital, skill, nor speculation, and yet gets a profit; and the third is, the middleman.

405. And you would call the sweating system a system under which a trade is carried on under those conditions?
Subject to one or other of those conditions.

406. To what trades do you find that that system extends?
Principally, most virulently, to the boot trade; less so, but very acutely, to the tailoring trade, specially to the vest and trousering department; and also to the making of shirts by women in the farther east; and in a less degree, but sufficiently distinctly, to the cabinet trade and upholstery.

407. Have you personally investigated the circumstances of these trades; have you visited the workshops yourself?
I have done so.

 408. What

408. What are commonly known as sweaters' dens?
A great many.

409. You speak from your own personal knowledge and experience?
Entirely, except where I say that I do not; only in a few instances have I had to employ agents.

410. I think, perhaps, the most convenient plan would be for you to give the Committee the general results of your investigation and experience as to the general condition of these various trades, with special reference to such matters as the hours of labour, the rate of wages, and the condition of the people employed in them; and afterwards I would call your attention to some specific points?
I think, perhaps, the most convenient plan in following your Lordship's suggestion would be to take the trades in alphabetical order, and, therefore, to take first the boot trade; and I would make, if I am allowed to do so, a general statement as to the boot trade, which, *mutatis mutandis*, would apply to each of the others; and then I would run through briefly the general evidence I have to give on the other trades. It is very important, in considering the sweating system as applied to the boot trade, to remember that the word "sweater" is used in the boot trade in precisely the opposite sense to that in which it is employed in the tailoring trade. The sweater in the boot trade, as the term used by the men themselves, is the man who is sweated; the sweater in the tailoring trade is the man who sweats, or the man who causes others to sweat; and when the evidence which is behind waiting is given, it will be very important to bear that in mind.

411. Then in which sense shall you use the term?
I shall use the term in its ordinary sense, so as not to have two meanings attached to it. I make that explanation beforehand, as the difference in the use of the term might lead to some misunderstanding. The system adopted in the East-end, in the slop boot trade (of which alone I am speaking), is for the small masters to employ two or three, sometimes six or seven or eight men, under them, called finishers. These small masters obtain work from the so-called manufactories. I use the phrase "so-called factories," because evidence is in existence, and will be called, of cases where the advertisements of these manufactories include a specific undertaking that the work and materials are guaranteed, while they do not know anything of the workman. Having obtained the work, these small masters are unable to affect the price of leather, or of ink, or of tools, or of rent, or of any of the other constituents in the cost of carrying out the work; and therefore the wages of the men, the team of men they employ, are the only factor in the problem of making the boot that is capable of being compressed, that is at all elastic. The effect of this system, according to the men (you will hear the masters' side of it as well), is that they, the men, receive an unfair proportion of the sums paid by the manufacturers. The system on which the work is carried out is this: The work taken from the manufacturers is divided in two departments, knifing and finishing. The first, knifing, requires some degree of skill, and is not infrequently carried out by the master himself. The master or knifer, or master and knifer, sometimes takes for his share of the labour one-half of the amount paid for the work. He can prepare the work for two, three, and sometimes four finishers. If, therefore, a dozen pairs of boots are paid for by the manufacturer at the rate of 4 *s.* a dozen, the master takes for his share 2 *s.*, and the balance, the remaining 2 *s.*, is divided between the three workmen, or 8 *d.* a piece. This shows the reason of the anxiety that the master or knifer has to increase the number of his men, because with every increase to the number of finishers he increases the amount of his own profits. But the master out of his moiety has to supply the men with a cup of coffee in the morning, and a cup of tea in the evening, in order to prevent them removing from their seats. That is the first obligation. The second obligation is that he "shops" the goods, or takes them home, brings them away from the manufactory (sometimes he has to pay a man to do that); and, in the third place, he has to find a workroom (which is generally

generally his living room), tools, light, firing, ink, sand-paper, twine, bottom ball, benzoline, oxalic acid, and all such things as are known in the trade under the name of "grindery," which is a term your Lordships will hear a good deal of. According to the masters, or some of the masters, "grindery" amounts to the equivalent of 6 *d.* a dozen pairs; but if the men's evidence is to be believed, "grindery" does not reduce the takings of the master by more than 2 *d.*, or at most 3 *d.*, a dozen. Now the grievance of the men against the masters in respect of earnings is that the latter, the masters, absorb far too large a proportion of the total takings; and it is difficult to resist the accuracy of this contention of the men, especially in cases (which are numerous, as will be shown) where the masters are not knifers, and where, in point of fact, they contribute nothing to the making of the boots, except providing the grindery, the rent, firing, and shopping the goods, taking them to shop; and, in fact, their only contribution to the work, where the master is not the knifer, is stimulating the men to longer hours, to increased exertions, and grinding them or lowering the wages. This point that I am putting before your Lordships will be made clear by taking a typical case supplied to me in the course of my investigations. A master who says that slavery has left America and taken up her residence in the East End of London, earns 7 *l.* 10 *s.* by contracting for 25 dozen of boots to be completed in a week. His moiety of this sum is 3 *l.* 15 *s.* Out of that he has to find rent of the "den," amounting to 3 *s.* 4 *d.*, gas 2 *s.* 6 *d.*, grindery 12 *s.* 6 *d.*, and a man to "shop" the goods 4 *d.*, those sums amounting to 1 *l.* 2 *s.* 4 *d.*, which, deducted from 3 *l.* 15 *s.*, leaves 2 *l.* 12 *s.* 8 *d.* as his total takings. This profit has been earned by him without a contribution by him of either capital or labour, or speculation. If instead of 12 *s.* 6 *d.*, which is his own estimate of grindery, the rate alleged by the men be correct, namely, 2 *d.* a dozen instead of 6 *d.* a dozen, and that be substituted for the 12 *s.* 6 *d.*, namely, 4 *s.* 2 *d.*, instead of 12 *s.* 6 *d.*, a further sum of 8 *s.* 4 *d.* must be added to the profits of the master. Now, it is not surprising that the anxiety of masters to obtain large orders leads to a system of money gifts and bribes to foremen and those who have the giving out of contracts, in order to obtain large quantities of work. Every extra man employed by the master is an additional profit to him. Evidence will be given in detail on this point. The men are powerless (as will be shown), by combination or otherwise, to resist the continual degradation of their lot, and diminution of their earnings; for they have the choice between taking the work at the price offered, and going elsewhere, their places being filled by "greeners" (which is a term your Lordship will hear a good deal of), or people newly arrived from Poland and Russia. It is necessary here, perhaps, to remark that this system of working the slop boot trade has been brought about by two factors that were not in existence a generation ago. The first is the invention and practical instruction of the riveted system of boot making 30 years ago. The other is the unrestricted influx of foreign paupers called "greeners" in the trade, always both willing and anxious to undercut or "scab" the work. They belong to no union, and are both able and willing to work for periods of time so prolonged as to be surprising to any one who has not actually seen them, in return for remuneration, which in some instances, as I will call evidence to show, is not above that of an Indian coolie, four or five annas a day. Formerly, when the hand-sewn system of boot making was the prevailing method, men were bound as apprentices, and it took several years to learn the trade. A man took a pride in his work. Then to become a bootmaker, a man had to learn the processes of lasting, rounding the stuff by hand with a knife, bottoming, and finishing. Since the introduction of sewing machines, the closing of uppers was a separate branch of the trade. Now, a man may become, if he is quick, of some value in a fortnight. I have a man in the room who has not been in England for a fortnight, and yesterday he was hard at work at one of these processes, not quite so quick or as expert as he will be in another six months, but at all events, so as to be of sufficient value to contribute to the export trade in boots. In four weeks these people, who come over from Russia, Poland, and Germany, may work 18 and 20 hours a day, and if they, never leaving their stools for food but take their

meals by their chairs, earn just sufficient to keep body and soul together, that is the meal of a man that I took from his chair (*producing a piece of bread*).

412. Is that his dinner?
That was the remains of his dinner; I took it from him at midnight. I mean to say, he had no meat or fish; nothing except the coffee and tea provided by the knifer, and this bread. There is another piece (*producing another piece of bread*) which I took yesterday, which is fresher. I produce those to show the ordinary food of the people. That (*pointing*) is a piece of bread which I took from a man yesterday afternoon.

413. What quantity do they get?
That I cannot say; I suppose they have enough or they could not go on working those hours; but I put these things in evidence simply to show the nature of the conditions of their life. The point I am on now is, that by working 18 or 20 hours a day, and eating food like that, a man just earns sufficient to keep body and soul together; and if he has left his wife in Poland or Russia he hopes in course of time to become a knifer himself, and, at all events, to bring his family over. With each introduction of new machinery, such as what is known as the American kit, labour became further sub-divided. The manufacture of boots was revolutionised by the riveting and machine-sewing systems, cutting presses, steel, sole, and heel cutters, &c., led to the division of the trade into a variety of sub-departments.

I am supplied with these details by Mr. Hoffman, who will be called as a witness before your Lordships, and who will speak with a thorough knowledge on that part of the subject. Men who worked at the bench, or seatsmen, as they were called, when these improvements took place, became either riveters or finishers, and in these two branches further sub-divisions of labour were created. Every riveter employed a boy to nail the boots, and generally another lad to put on and "knife" the heels. Knifing the heels is trimming the rough leather in this state (*producing a boot*).

414. Lord *Thring*.] What is riveting?
Riveting is fastening the sole on.

415. By what?
By nails and a hammer, or they prefer to use a file. The finishing, requiring no machinery, or only very portable machinery, can be carried out at the workmen's own homes, or at the sweaters' homes, and it became capable of very much further sub-division of labour; and there sprang up quickly team after team of half-skilled men and boys, each performing from one end of the week to the other one small mechanical operation requiring so little skill as hardly to rank the trade among skilled ones. Before the introduction of the American kit of tools, to which I just now alluded, the knifer, usually the master, was necessarily a skilled shoemaker, because the trimming of edges and heels had to be done with an ordinary shoemaker's knife, and not with the spokeshave or plane that is now employed Those boots are rounded by a plane (*producing some boots*). Both skill and judgment were required when the trimming was done with a knife; now it is merely the performance of a mechanical operation. The other operations, however, such as filing, buffing, inking, burnishing, were easily learned, and thus facilities were offered for learners and "greeners" to crowd into the trade in shoals, competing for employment, and thus established the sweating system; the sweating system in the boot trade being, as far as my investigations have gone, the result of two evils, one the improvement in machinery, and the immense influx (I use the term immense influx advisedly; I shall be very glad to answer any questions on it) of pauper foreigners from abroad. The fluctuations of trade rendered weekly wages for the most part impracticable, and the sweating system lent itself to piecework which necessarily came into existence. The introduction of piecework, in the finishing department was largely accelerated by the introduction of new tools, which are always being improved. Instead of the knifing being done by the slow and skilful method of the ordinary knife, the work was done by the shaves which I have described. The work

work was thus done correctly, mechanically, in a shorter time, and without skill; and for common work it is possible for the greener to become a knifer in a few weeks. It is important to bear this in mind, as the last relic of skill in the mechanical operation of the slop boot trade was knifing; and now, as we shall see, knifing itself can be acquired, at all events for the purposes of some earning value, in the course of a few weeks. The ranks of the manufacturers were rapidly crowded by persons having no knowledge of the trade. With a little capital they purchased machinery, &c., engaged a competent foreman, and a few hands for the various departments. The competition became intense; everyone endeavoured to increase his output of boots, and to increase the number of his customers. These boot manufacturers, not being boot makers, had no pride in their work, and the consequence is, that the colonial markets are flooded with work of the most atrocious and abominable description. If your Lordships will look at those boots (*producing some boots*), you will see three rounds of paper in the heels; and this (*producing a piece of paper*) is a piece of paper taken out between the sole and the upper.

416. *Chairman.*] What would those be described as in the trade?

Mr. Hoffmann will answer those technical questions. I have been told, but it has slipped my memory. (*After an interval.*) I am told that the term for those is "cloth, lace, with mock-kid vamp and goloshe."

417. Do you know what the price of those is, the selling price?

I am told about 4 *s.* I see that I have in my notes that the price paid for the work of finishing these was 4 *d.* a pair, 4 *s.* a dozen; of which, as I explained, the knifer takes half.

418. You say that the cost of finishing them is so much; in what condition do they come to the finisher?

That (*pointing to a boot*) is the condition in which they come from the manufacturer to the sweater; in the condition of the boot that is not torn open.

419. Earl of *Limerick.*] The heels and soles are finished afterwards?

Yes. I want to point out this. You see that nail there? A man using his knife in rounding it breaks his tool. It is of the most atrocious and worthless description of work.

420. Lord *Thring.*] Do I understand that the machine produces these things?

The machine produces a thing like that (*pointing*). This is done by a sewing machine, and these are fastened on by machinery (*pointing*); and then they come into the hands of the sweater and his team of workmen, and they go through processes on which I will produce evidence a little later on.

421. We may consider then that the history of the boot begins after it has attained that form (*pointing to a boot*)?

Yes, as far as I am concerned.

422. *Chairman.*] I suppose that is only one out of a great variety?

Yes; I only took that as an example off a man's bench.

423. Earl of *Derby.*] Did I understand you to say that a man in this occupation worked 18 or 20 hours a day?

Yes.

424. When you say that, do you mean that that is occasional?

No, usual. I will produce the fullest evidence upon the length of hours, man after man. I will produce a hundred men if you like. I do not say it is going on all the year round; but while they have work they work at that rate. I was inclined myself to discredit it until I found that it really was so.

425. Have you any instance of a man who worked 18 hours a day for a week continuously?

Not for a week, because there is the Jewish Sabbath, and there is the Christian Sunday; but for 4½ days.

426. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] Eighteen to twenty hours for 4½ days?

I will say 18, and be well under the mark. I have men in the room who have worked over that

427. *Chairman.*] Have you any evidence to give us yourself on this point later?

I have, in full detail. It would be better, perhaps, for me to make my general statement first. I want, as far as possible, to let the men speak for themselves about these points. All the statements I am making now will, I venture to think, be corroborated by the evidence you will subsequently call, by first-hand evidence. In some factories the sweating system has been still further exacerbated by the substitution of boys for men; and in the sweaters' shops the presence of lads and the girls and women of the family is constantly to be seen. Evidence will be placed before your Lordships that any attempts on the part of workmen to combine for the three purposes, or for one of the three purposes, of restricting the working hours, of increasing the proportion of the earnings of the men arising from the sub-contracts, and inducing Parliament to register workshops, which is what they want, are regarded with a very hostile eye by the masters, and would lead to the instant dismissal of the offenders. The attention of the Committee will be drawn to the case of a man named Samuel Wildman, who, I hope, will be called first He was a teacher in Hungary. He will tell you that he learned the finishing trade in four weeks; that he had no pay when he began; that he worked until midnight, and came at five o'clock in the morning; that is to say, he worked 19 hours; he had his meals in his chair where he sat and worked. After a year he determined not to work for more than 12 hours a day, but found trade so bad that he could not get a living without working 18 hours a day. When he reached home at night he was so tired that he slept with his head on the table, too exhausted to go to bed. He will tell you that he wants shorter hours, and the Factory Act applied to his trade. Combination, or even remonstrance, is regarded as insubordination in most cases; and the struggle for existence compels men to accept any terms, for, where one refuses, a dozen are willing to take starvation wages. The enormous length of hours regularly worked during the season that is now on by the boot operatives, is almost without parallel in other trades. So long as work is obtainable, toil continues until nature breaks down. From six or seven o'clock in the morning until 11 or 12 o'clock, and even later in the night, are not unusual hours. I have taken care to corroborate that by a good many visits after midnight, where I find the men hard at work. Men of 40 years of age are old men, worn out; a large proportion of the workers during part of the year earn very small wages indeed. Scanty and innutritious food is having its result on the stamina of the next generation. The life of the sweaters' men is so hopeless and dreary, that their feelings against the order of things are not unnaturally bitter and intense. I would call your Lordships' attention to the evidence of a man named Hyman Kreisberg, whom I took from the bench just as I found him within a week; I found him at midnight working intently, having toiled since seven in the morning, not moving from his seat, taking his scanty meal of bread and coffee by his side, his life passing without resource, or amusement, or recreation of any kind, with no hope for the future, and no pleasure in the past. There is nothing peculiar about the man's case, he is one of a type, and can speak for himself as such. It is not to be wondered at that men living under these conditions are the raw material for revolutionary propaganda; I have here a newspaper (*handing it to the Committee*) published in Hebrew, that your Lordships may not have heard of, it is a newspaper published this month.

428. Where is that published?

It is published in the Commercial-road.

429. Lord *Rothschild.*] It is German in Hebrew characters?

Yes, it is what they call Jüdisch. Your Lordships noticed what I said about the raw material of revolutionary agitation. That newspaper is published this week; it bears the date of the 30th of April, but I obtained it this week. With your

your permission I will read you two pages which I have had translated to show you the sort of intellectual material that is being provided for these people who are suffering this sort of life that I am trying to describe. "The Working Men's Friend. What we have to expect from those fine people. There are still many between the poor people who are still so ignorant that they believe that they will be able to arrange with the capitalists an improvement to the benefit of the people, that there should not be so much poverty in the world. We can see, they say, that there are many rich men who call themselves good friends of the poor, and who confess that it is necessary to improve the world, that there should not be so much poverty, and they also say, if it would depend upon them, they would do a great deal of good. Now it is still to be expected that in time there will be more of these great men convinced that the world cannot remain in the present state, and they will endeavour to alter it in a peaceable manner. But we always say that those fine people, with their fine tongues, are for our workmen the most dangerous, for they dazzle our silly brethren. We and all the enlightened working men know that when a wolf puts on a sheep's skin he is still a wolf, and it is very dangerous for a sheep to believe in his friendship to sheep. The rich, who have so much pleasure and so much luxury, will be, through their splendid circumstances, so much out of order and spoiled, that they will become another kind of animal, beasts of prey (there are exceptions in tame wolves, but they are so few that they do not alter the rule one hair), and they consider the poor as another kind of creature, only created to be swallowed; just as some nobles have believed that their blood is purer and nobler than that of peasants. That we know, but with regret for our foolish brethren, those smooth-tongued people are dangerous, because they think that they may depend upon their pure heart and may put their hands into their pockets." And it goes on in that socialistic style till it comes to what is a very remarkable feature, the invention of extracts from newspapers about poverty and riches. Now, here is a paragraph put into the mouth of Dr. Henry Ward Beecher. I cannot actually say he never used the words, but it is unlikely. They give these extracts as typical of the feelings of the rich to the poor. They quote Dr. Henry Ward Beecher as saying: "Give the workmen who ask for higher wages some bursting bombs, therewith we will get rid of some of them, and the rest will get sense, 'Chicago Times.' It is need the world should be cleared from those poor rubbish who disfigure our handsome streets with their work parcels, and who disturb the finest speculations with their constant noise to ask for higher wages." Then from the "Chicago Tribune": "The only means there is to make an end of the pretensions of the working men is to put in the meat, or in other provisions which the working men must eat, strychnine or any other poison that is a speedy and sure death for all who will eat of it, and be a good lesson for the others. 'The people must suffer to be hung;' thus expresses himself the milliard King Vanderbilt; 'they ought to take away from those poor people the right to vote, then we will be able to manage them better.'" I put those quotations in to show the credulity of the class I am describing; I need not read more of them, but I will put the document in.

430. *Chairman.*] Is that paper published every month?
I am told every week.

431. Lord *Thring.*] What is the circulation of it?
I cannot say.

432. Do you know at all among what class it circulates?
I got this from people in the boot trade.

433. Do you know who the publishers are?
I see it written on the top there; it is published at some place in Commercial-street.

434. Do you know who are the persons who run the risk of the publication?
I know nothing about it, except that I have often been told of these papers, and I have had the curiosity to get this translated. That almost concluded the general statement I shall make. But I wish to remark here that I believe it to be incorrect to say that the demand for cheap goods is in any sense the cause of the

the sweating system. Everybody wants cheap bread, but you do not find the price of bread reduced by the desire of people to get cheap bread. The selling price of bread and tea, and so on, is not affected by the public desire for cheapness to any extent; wages have fallen in the trade since 1880, which is about the period when the influx of foreigners began to any extent. Work that was then paid for at the rate of 6 *d.* is now paid for at the rate of 4 *d.*, and I find that that fall in wages occurs in the other trades which are affected by the sweating system, the sweating system being apparently invariably accompanied by the two conditions that I have mentioned at the beginning, the improvement in machinery and the influx of poor foreigners; when you do not get the poor foreigners you do not get the sweating system as we understand it. I do not say it is absolutely dependent upon that influx, but it is accompanied by it. If a capitalist master in order to get work bribes the foremen of shops, the little employer who has no capital is unable to offer inducements to the foremen of shops, except by offering to do the work for less money, and, as he cannot reduce the price of the leather or any of the other factors, he is obliged to make up that loss out of the wages of the men; and the workmen will tell you that they feel the suffering caused by this cutting down process more than the master, because the margin of profit remains the same to the master, he having no capital and very often putting no labour into the work. If a man employs three men and they earn 3 *s.* each a day he gets 9 *s.* If their wages are lowered to 2 *s.* 6 *d.* he still receives 7 *s.* 6 *d.* One of the grievances that the men will place before your Lordships is the great number of hours that they have to wait for their work. It constantly happens that they cannot get any from the shops until seven or eight o'clock in the evening, which compels them to work until five or six o'clock the next morning to finish a task which might have been given them earlier in the day. There is no system of any kind. Employment is precarious, and there is constant privation between periods of excessive and exhaustive toil and the idleness of unemployment. One master states to me that he is compelled to employ more men than he did, at lower wages, through the crushing and cutting process inflicted on him from above, while machinery has reinforced the natural influences at work. He says, further, with regard to the "greeners," that many of them belong to miscellaneous trades, and learn shoemaking to a large extent with great facility, and in increasing numbers; that the pressure from above forces the small masters to transmit the pressure to below, to pass it on. As an example of such pressure, he instances the obligation placed on him by an employer to take tickets in a benefit society in which the employer is interested; he dare not refuse, and of course that is so much less that he can give to the men. The great competition for work among the small masters is one of the large contributory causes of the sweating system. Now with regard to the factors, large agents who are called factors, who buy in three-quarters of their supplies and make one-quarter themselves, it is alleged, and I believe truly, that they only make profit out of the sweating involved in the three fourths bought in, as they do not inquire into the origin of the work; which is a charge which I think can be brought against Her Majesty's Government, as I will show later on.

435. Lord *Rothschild.*] Will you explain that last point more fully?

A large order is given to a merchant for several thousand pairs of boots; he goes to a boot manufacturer, a man at the top of the trade; the manufacturer, the factor, is unable to supply all these boots himself; he can supply a quarter of them; the other three-quarters he has to, what is called, buy in; well, he buys in from these sweaters, and the boots are delivered to him according to pattern, in the same way as I described to you; and the work is done in that manner. What is alleged is this, that he makes his profit not out of the quarter of the order that he makes in his own factory, and which is subject, of course, to the Factory Act, but he makes his "profit" on the extremely low prices that he gave for the three-quarters of the order that he has received from the colonies or elsewhere.

436. *Chairman.*] Do you say that that affects Government contracts?

I think I shall succeed in showing that later on.

437. Lord

437. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury*.] An order comes from the colony to the merchant, who is the merchant you spoke of, the manufacturer?
The merchant is the agent of the people who order from the colony. I am only taking a typical case, a large merchant.

438. Lord *Thring*.] Do I understand you to say that the merchant makes one-quarter himself?
The boot manufacturer will in the case supposed make a quarter.

439. And he buys in three-quarters?
Yes.

440. Do I understand you to say that the goods he makes and the goods he buys in are the same in quality?
I did not express an opinion about that; I am not competent to do so.

441. I understand you to put this case: I will assume that I am a merchant, and that I have a contract for a hundred thousand pairs of boots; I understand you to say that one-quarter of that hundred thousand I make myself, and that I buy in three-quarters?
Yes.

442. Of course these boots are supplied to sample?
Yes.

443. Therefore, the boots I make myself and the boots I buy in must be of the same quality?
They should be.

444. On the other hand, the expense of production, as I understand it, of the one-quarter that I manufacture is probably, in your opinion, double or treble that of the other three-quarters?
I do not state the proportion.

445. But it is a very great proportion, I understand you?
I did not venture on stating a proportion.

446. The manufacturer makes his boots in a manner you do not complain of as to the one-quarter?
Certainly not; I do not complain of the quarter; I want to see the whole of the boots made in a registered factory.

447. Lord *Rothschild*.] Your evidence would tend to prove that the manufacturers cannot make a profit at the price that exists on the boots that are made in the factory?
Yes.

448. Lord *Thring*.] Do I understand you that all or the majority (I do not mean all in the strict sense, but that a very great majority) of the persons in the sweating trade are foreigners?
What does your Lordship mean by the sweating trade, may I ask?

449. I will put it in this way: that the greater number of the persons employed in the making of these boots, of which you complain, are foreigners, as I understand it?
Almost exclusively.

450. In your opinion the bad trade is maintained by the influx of foreigners?
It is difficult to answer that question with a yes or no; I have such piles of evidence on the subject that it would want qualification; but I am roughly and broadly of that opinion; not by the influx of foreign labour, but of pauper labour. Supposing they were Chinese instead of being Poles.

451. They are not English?
It is not the fact of their not being not English, but of their being paupers.

452. But the pauper English labour does not go into the trade?

No, the conditions of comfort or of life in the case of an Englishman are such that he will neither work the hours nor eat the food.

453. Earl of *Derby.*] Did I take down accurately what you said, that were there no poor foreigners, there could be no sweating system?

Yes, that is practically accurate; I said that I had not found any sweating system in the slop boot trade where there are no poor foreigners.

454. Then, as you put it, the result of stopping this immigration of pauper foreigners would be, without any further measure, to put an end to the sweating system?

I am very strongly of that opinion. With reference to the question that was asked just now by a noble Lord as to the character of the work, the work is often atrociously bad, the work of the export orders. I have shown you a pair of boots to-day, for export, and large importers in the colonies tell me that we have flooded the market with goods of an atrociously bad description; goods made by these sweaters. Moreover, under the system home and family life are destroyed. The temperance and industry of these foreigners are most remarkable. The unwholesome absence of all recreation bears very hardly upon those with whom they compete, the native workers. There are two trades unions, small ones, among the Jewish workmen; one organised by the masters who take the work from the shops, and one by the men who aid them in the completion of the work. Now I venture to suggest some things that might be done; practicable things; measures capable of being carried out, which would probably affect favourably the lives of the workers. The first is the restriction of foreigner pauper or "greener" immigration, especially of elderly men, men over 50 years of age, ignorant of their trade, speaking no language but their own, and bringing no money with them. The second is the extension of the Factory Acts to adult males; and the third the registration of all work-rooms, the certificate of registration to be affixed outside the house, and every room in the house so certificated to be accessible to the factory and sanitary inspector, offices which should be combined. Further, the abolition of the separate, conflicting, and contradictory duties of the sanitary and factory inspector, the one being under the parochial authority and the other the servant of the Imperial Government. There is considerable doubt as to the exact limit of the duties of either, and there is a tendency for the inspector to leave to the sanitary official and for the sanitary official to leave to the inspector, matters which require prompt and effective treatment. Further, a very large increase in the number of the inspectors, and an improvement in the nature of their qualifications. If a miner's inspector should be equipped with a practical knowledge of mining, surely an inspector of shoe-sweating shops should be a practical shoemaker. At all events from the clause in the Factory Act of 1878, the 40th of Her Majesty, whereby living rooms and families are now exempted from inspection, that exemption should be removed. And lastly, an increase of the fines for infraction either of the Health or Factory Acts, and the payment of the fine to informers. Such is briefly the general evidence which I have to give on the bootmaking trade. There is a great deal more which I might give.

455. *Chairman.*] I gather from what you have said that you would attribute the evils of the sweating system to what may be called irremediable causes, such as the introduction of machinery and so on, and also to remediable causes, or causes which you consider to be remediable, which would be of three kinds; the foreign pauper immigration; the fact that the existing and Factory Acts and Sanitary Acts are not sufficiently carried out; and also that they are not sufficiently extensive in their operations?

That is so.

456. Now as to the foreign immigration, can you give the Committee any more detailed information as to the extent and amount of it, and as to the effect that it produces; is the pauper immigration, to your knowledge, increasing or decreasing?

As compared with what time.

457. I think

457. I think you took the year 1880 as being the commencement of the fall in wages?
Yes.

458. Since 1880 has there been an increase or a decrease of the pauper immigration?
At the present moment, the 13th day of April, I do not believe that the immigration of paupers is increasing, because snow is on the ground in Russia; but up to last September I had every reason to believe that it was increasing. I hear of 53 men who arrived on Sunday. One of the men I shall call came over with nine paupers only a fortnight ago, and I have any quantity of evidence in these boxes now by my side which will put a very different complexion on the subject from that given to your Lordships by Mr. Stephany.

459. Can you give the Committee the facts, the statistics as to the numbers?
I can give no statistics. I frankly admit at once that I am unable to give statistics, for they do not exist. I have set men to watch; I have sent men to Hull, and I have men at the docks watching; and if any of your Lordships will accompany me I will take you to where they are set out for hire.

460. What induces them to come?
At the present moment I believe the inducement is the belief that London is a place that is paved with gold, and that the conditions of life for the working classes here are very much higher and more comfortable than they are there, but the distress among these poor people is so great that many of them find out their mistake when they arrive here.

461. Are they induced to come by false pretences, false advertisements; anything of that kind?
I have heard it stated (I do not know it of my own knowledge) that an advertisement appeared in a Cardiff paper in Hebrew, which was alleged to be copied from a Polish newspaper, but I have never succeeded in authenticating that advertisement. But it is the interest of the masters to encourage the flow of pauper immigration, because it enables them to go on reducing wages in this way, and where people have a money interest in the thing it is obvious that they will not discourage them from coming. I think the extreme generosity of the Jewish community to their co-religionists, of which I could give instances, has a very marked effect. There is a man in the room here who came over a fortnight ago; he came over with the certainty of support until he got work; he went to the Jewish House of Shelter in Leman-street; I shall produce his card; he is now working for his bread and his tea; when he has earned enough he will send for his wife. Now that is a typical instance.

462. You say when he has earned enough he will send for his wife, but just before you said that he is working for his bread and his tea only?
The next thing is that he will get wages, and when he is a little more expert he will send for his wife; he cannot talk a word of English. I think the Jewish House of Shelter is one of the elements that is very attractive to these poor foreigners. So also are such institutions as the Free School, one of the most magnificent educational institutions in the world, I suppose; it is like a lamp set upon a hill; they can come over here and have their children educated very cheaply, for nothing. I do not say that the Free School by itself is the attraction, but I do think the extraordinary generosity of the Jewish community, and the manner in which they meet the wants of their co-religionists, seems to relieve these people who do come over of any sense of unwisdom, which they would be confronted with if they were to try to go to America or to France.

463. Have you any idea what proportion of them may be actually described as paupers?
They may be divided into three classes; there are first the elderly men, who are my aversion, the men who come over as old men, men over 50, men who have a vague desire to get to America. Then there are the middle-aged men who are militarily free, who have passed the army; and then there are young men who come over, some of them from political causes. I think that many of the

the young men who come are a distinct strength and accession to the community; but, as regards the old men, and the married men with large families, whatever their numbers be, whether they be great or whether they be few, the effect of their coming is to saturate these three trades, and partially saturate a fourth trade, and in doing so to cause an amount of misery throughout thousands and thousands of native workers, out of all proportion to the actual numbers of the pauper foreigners who come over. It is not their numbers, but it is what effect they produce. If the wage, for instance, in the boot trade is 10,000 *l.* a week, and 10,000 men are required to work 12 hours a day, and 100 foreigners come over, it stands to reason that one of two things must happen; either the wages must be reduced *pro tanto*, or 100 of the English workers must go out and be replaced by 100 foreigners, that is to say, that, if there are 10,000 men employed in the trade, the coming of 100 foreigners into that trade would affect the whole of the trade. That is why I consider that the effects which are demonstrable are so very much more important than the numbers which are not demonstrable.

464. When you speak of "English" workers being thrown out of work by their coming, do you mean English-born people?
Yes.

465. The children of foreigners who have been residing in this country?
Yes.

466. What becomes of these pauper-foreigners when they arrive?
Some of them go to the Synagogue and are kept for a few days until they get work; a very large number of them go to friends belonging to families of the same town. One of the men I have got here in the room went to his friends, and one went to the House of Shelter in Leman-street.

467. Then, practically, they know what to do when they come here?
Yes.

468. They do not fall into the hands of crimps?
I should be very sorry to say that they did not sometimes; but they do not generally suffer in that way now.

469. Where do they mostly come from?
From round Odessa, from Mensk, and from the borders of Russian Poland.

470. Do you think that as a rule they succeed in making themselves independent, or do a large proportion of them become eventually chargeable on our rates?
Not on our rates, not on the parochial rates. There were only 376 foreigners relieved in the Whitechapel Union last year. They are remarkable for the most invincible and pertinacious industry; such industry that you cannot watch it without learning a lesson, and I never saw anything like it. They seem never to think of amusement or recreation of any kind. I never saw a drunken foreigner, never saw one of them the worse for drink. They are most respectable, attached to their families, very fond of their children, very bright and intelligent, most of them.

471. You consider, in fact, that the influx of pauper immigrants is the cause of the sweating system; not that the sweating system has produced this influx of pauper foreign immigration?
I think that the causes and the effects are contributory; the one contributes to the other. It would be impossible to analyse the two, but I believe that the immigration of paupers has a very far greater effect upon the sweating system than the sweating system as known in "Alton Locke" had on the immigration of foreigners.

472. Lord *Rothschild.*] The introduction of machinery and the development of it has also been a cause of the sweating system?
Yes.

472*. And the difficulty of establishing factories in London?

I cannot

I cannot say yes to that, because I think the registration of the existing workshops would destroy the little men and drive the bigger ones into the country.

473. Lord *Thring*.] I want to get this a little clearer; I understand you to say that these men, paupers though they be, are men of unparallelled industry, that the majority of them get up in the world?

I did not say that the majority of them get up in the world.

474. That was the inference I drew; is that a correct inference?

I do not think it is a correct inference.

475. Do you think that they remain in this abject state of slavery continually?

Yes, and that must be so, that industry has not the reward under the sweating system that it has in other departments of life.

476. But still they come, and they come; therefore they consider their condition in England better than their condition in their own country, do they not?

They do not consider that after they get here.

477. We heard from Mr. Stephany that a great many are sent back; do you agree that they are, or do you think that they are not?

I should be very sorry to contradict any evidence given by Mr. Stephany, though I do not agree with some of his statements; if he says that they are sent back, I am bound to admit it.

478. As the general result, I understand that these foreigners come here, and that they do not get the reward of their industry; they are ground to death earlier than other people?

Yes.

479. Earl of *Derby*.] Have you not spoken of many of them being persons of remarkable intelligence?

Yes, I have been wonderfully struck with that, especially in the case of the children.

480. If that is so, would it not be enough to let them know what the real state of the case is, and then might it not be presumed that others would not come?

That has been urgently pressed upon the Foreign Office for the last two years, but they decline to do it owing to political reasons. I have again and again urged the Foreign Office to have placards printed in the vernacular and distributed in the Consulates in the districts affected broadly throughout the villages, warning the people of the existing state of the markets in England. The Jewish Board of Guardians last year sent out a circular, so great was the evil, and that circular, no doubt, had a very good effect. But my contention is, that a thing of that Imperial importance ought not to be left to a local body like the Jewish Board of Guardians, but should be done by the government of the country.

481. Here are men, you say, of remarkable intelligence and industry, who persist in coming to an overcrowded market, where their labour is underpaid; would it not be, in your opinion, a sufficient remedy for that if ample notice were given at the ports from which they come of the state of things they will find here, and of the improbability of their obtaining a livelihood here?

I do not think that will be sufficient, because many of these people are propelled by political reasons, and are forced to leave. If their coming were altogether voluntary it would be sufficient, no doubt.

482. But in the case of those who are, as you say, propelled by political reasons; in other words, who come here to take refuge from persecution or annoyance at home, would you be prepared to say that they should not be allowed to land?

I would, because we owe, it seems to me, justice and humanity to our own people before we owe it to foreigners.

483. Then you would object to them, not on account of their being unable to maintain themselves, because you say they are industrious, but because they compete unpleasantly with the native labour?

"Unpleasantly" is a very mild term; they compete in such ways that women are driven to the streets when they were not formerly, and that men are forced to live lives which are not human lives.

484. I suppose you would say, as a rule, that an influx of population remarkable for intelligence and industry would be an advantage to the community into which they come?

If England is the only country where the influx takes place, then the addition of an unlimited number of intelligent and industrious poor people is by no means an advantage. I do not consider that a reinforcement of our community by, say, the Chinese, who are very industrious, would be an advantage.

485. Am I wrong in saying that their industry being greater than that, as you put it, of the average London workmen, constitutes part of your objection to it?

No; I stated that because I think it is better to tell all the facts, whether they tell for or against the point I am trying to make.

486. You will be prepared later on to furnish evidence of the extraordinary number of hours which you say these men are willing to work?

They had better speak of that themselves.

487. Earl of *Limerick.*] You have confined yourself, I think, entirely in your statement to the boot trade?

So far.

488. You are prepared to give evidence as to the other trades also?

Yes; the cabinet trade next.

489. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] You spoke of the wage fund and of the arrival of 100 people displacing 100 others; do you consider the wage fund to be fixed; for instance, the bringing of fresh hands ought to increase the work which can be done by England and exported; why should we treat the wage fund as fixed, as a certain sum to be divided up?

I only take the boot trade as it is, not as an abstract question of political economy. I find that in 1880 we exported 3,200,000 *l.* worth of boots, and notwithstanding the sweating system and the pauper foreigners who had come in, and the enormous impulse that had been given to the industry of the men and the length of their hours, we had only increased in 1886, the latest date we have statistics for, to 3,900,000 *l.*, which is really not more than the normal rate of increase.

490. Lord *Sandhurst.*] Do you think that there are any crimps at the port of landing who take "greeners" to sweaters' shops?

I produced a man at the Home Office who gave evidence to that effect, but I do not think the system is so far established that you can say that it is a system now. It has been very largely put down by the benevolent action of the management of the House of Shelter in Leman-street, but I think isolated cases occur.

491. But how do they in the first instance find out theses sweaters' shops; by their friends?

It is partly owing to their friends.

492. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Do you know anything of the sources in Poland or Russia from which immigrants come, or do they come from various classes?

Miscellaneous classes of trades.

493. Chiefly from towns?

I should not say chiefly; some from towns like Odessa, and some from country districts. You can tell them by their boots.

494. Lord

494. Lord *Sandhurst.*] Are these paupers that come over tolerably well behaved population?
Admirably behaved as regards morality; abominably behaved as regards cleanliness.

495. *Chairman.*] There is one point on which I am not quite clear, and that is the distinction you draw between foreigners and natives; as I understand you, the natives are also of foreign origin?
Is your Lordship speaking of the boot trade?

496. Yes?
They are practically all foreigners.

497. How do you draw the distinction between them?
When I referred to natives I was referring to the boot trade at Northampton and Leicester, and elsewhere, the wages in which are necessarily affected by the competition of the foreigners in the slop trade in London.

498. But the men engaged in London in the slop trade you would call all foreigners?
I think it is accurate to say that they are all foreigners; I have not come across a single Englishman among them.

499. When you speak of the superior intelligence and industry of the foreigners, do you mean that the foreigners on arriving are more intelligent and industrious than the descendants of the same people, or than the same people themselves after they have resided here for some years?
The intelligence is more remarkable in the second generation; the industry they bring with them on arrival.

500. They are more industrious on arrival?
They are more industrious on arrival than the average worker of that class; I mean they constantly work for 17 or 18 hours, at all events, without any loud or hostile cry against it.

501. Have you any idea whether, generally speaking, they have been accustomed to similar hours of labour and conditions of life in their own country?
I believe not; I have been informed by them that they have no such hours in their own country.

502. In your opinion is their condition improved over here?
In the generality of cases it is not improved except that escape from tyranny and from being turned out of house and home, is of course an improvement for those who come here from political reasons; those who come here to better themselves are not improved.

503. Lord *Thring.*] Then why do they come?
They come from the two causes; many of them come from political reasons.

504. But I mean non-political ones; why do they come?
They come to improve themselves.

505. But they must have known by this time of this system; there have been five years at all events during which this system has been in existence; they must have known of it?
The type of many of them as they arrive is extremely low, as your Lordship will see directly.

506. But you spoke just now of their intelligence; if the type is very low they cannot be very intelligent, can they?
The children are more intelligent than the first generation.

507. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] They come here very industrious, and their children become very intelligent?
Yes.

508. *Chairman.*] I should like to ask you as to the unequal division of profits between the masters and the men; have you any idea in your own mind of

of any remedy that is to be applied to that; is there any combination, do you think, among the men?

The only remedy that I can see for that is to assist the men by every means in one's power to make trades' unions; I see nothing else.

509. Have they any trades' unions at present?

There are two; there is the Jewish Journeymen Working Men Boot Finisher Society, the officers of which are here, but they are not a strong body, and they are not capable of doing very much for themselves at present; but I wish to help them as far as possible.

510. Is it your opinion that the men are unable by combination to do anything to bring about a fairer division of profits?

Unable at the present time, in fact; not unable potentially; if we can get them a strong society, I see no reason why they should not produce the same effect by union as they have done in other trades.

511. If that is possible, how is it that that has not been originated?

Because, when a man is working 18 hours a day, he has no time for combination.

512. Lord *Clinton.*] The workers, as I understand, are foreigners?

Yes.

513. But are the masters never foreigners?

Almost always foreigners.

514. Of the same nationalities as the working men?

Yes, Poles and Russians.

515. Are they men who have risen, who have been sweated?

Invariably.

516. They are men who have succeeded, in fact?

The condition of many of the masters is hardly better than that of the men.

517. Still they get a very large proportion of the profits?

It is alleged by the men that they get an undue proportion as their share of the profits; but if that only goes on for three months of the year, during part of the year they are reduced to a destitution hardly to be distinguished from the destitution of the men.

518. But they have a certain amount of capital before they become masters, have they not?

No.

519. They do not require it?

No, they require to be known; they require to have the capital of character with the manufacturers, so that they are trusted with the goods.

520. *Chairman.*] Now as to the question of inspection, is it your opinion that the existing Sanitary Acts and Factory Acts are not properly enforced?

The Factory Act does not apply to the boot trade, because they are adult males that are employed in it.

521. But what is your opinion of the administration of it?

I think it is a farce.

522. Why?

If your Lordship has seen the Report for 1887 of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops, and will turn to the number of inspectors there are, you will find that Mr. Lakeman, of the Home Office, has the whole of the Metropolis east of Farringdon-road to Wapping, then northward to Cambridge Heath, Stamford Hill, thence to Barnet, Hatfield, Watford, Rickmansworth, Tring, West Hertfordshire and Middlesex to Willesden, thence to Farringdon-road. He has the help of Mr. Birtwistle in the West Metropolitan district. Now, how is it possible for those two men to have the slightest effect upon the

evils

evils that exist with such a population? I have been round repeatedly and seen these evils; they are indescribable from a sanitary point of view; they go on existing as they are. These gentlemen work extremely hard, late at night and early in the morning; it is a hopeless task.

523. Your opinion is that the staff is too small?
I think it is so small as to be a travesty; that is to say, we have an Act of Parliament which provides so-and-so, and the Act of Parliament is substantially a dead letter.

524. Is there any determination, do you think, on the part of the employers to evade the visits of the factory inspectors?
I do not think that the better class of employers dislike them at all. With regard to the worst employers, though they are bound to put up abstracts of the Act of 1878, large abstracts, they are a dead letter to a very large extent, as I will show your Lordships. I put it to your Lordships whether that document (*exhibiting a document*), written in English, and stuck up on the wall, is of the slightest use to a man who can speak only a few words of English, and who is a foreigner; whether it is of the slightest use in protecting these people who are employed under him. To be of any practical common sense use an abstract should be made in the Hebrew character, and very short, just showing what the workmen have a right to under the Act. This is constantly evaded. I have been round myself with the sub-inspector, and in shop after shop we found none of these on the wall; and when the man is asked why, he says, "I have it in a drawer, and will put it up," and he puts it up. This pretends to be a protection for the workmen, but in no sense is it a protection for the workmen.

525. You think that the workmen do not understand it?
Not in the least.

526. You have stated also that the Act should be extended to adult males, and also be applied to ordinary dwelling houses where any work is carried out?
Yes; I think wherever a workshop exists it ceases to be a home; and if the people who are at work are unable to protect themselves sanitarily, or in other ways, I think it is the duty of the State to see that in the interest of the next generation the stamina of the population is not seriously injured.

527. You mean that the factory inspector should have access to any man's house, or any room in the house, if work is carried on there?
Yes, I do.

528. Even if it is done by members of his own family?
Yes, even by members of his own family. The two clauses in the Act of 1878 are the principal cover to most of the abuses. If you have a truckle bed in the corner of a room (as is constantly put for the purpose), and one of the boys sleeping there, that room is exempt from visitation; it is a living room.

529. And you think also that the inspectors under the Factory Acts and the sanitary authorities do not pull together; that they rather shift the responsibility from one to the other?
I think so.

530. What would you suggest?
I should like to see the sanitary officer removed from the risk of dismissal by the parochial authorities if he is too active in his work. The sanitary inspector is not infrequently a man very superior to the parochial authorities, and I should like to see him secure in his position, so that he could fearlessly report abuses and evils without the possibility of reprimand or removal in consequence of his doing his duty. Your Lordships will remember the case of Dr. Murphy, who did his duty in St. Pancras. And I would rather see the sanitary authority and the Factory Act inspector both under the Home Office; that is, both under the Imperial Government, not under the Local Government.

531. Lord *Thring*.] With respect to extending factory inspection to adult men,

men, do you think that the Lancashire operative who belongs to a trades union, which probably has 20,000 members, cannot take care of himself?

Then why not exempt him from the Act.

532. How would you do it?

I submit that that is a point of detail which it is possible for the human mind to overcome; I am not prepared with a suggestion at present.

533. I should like to know how you say it is a point of detail. If you have no suggestion I will not press you upon it?

I think I should have temerity enough to venture to make a suggestion. The evils of which we are speaking exist only at the bottom of the lowest trades; and I see no reason why the registration of the workshop should press hardly upon the 20,000 operatives in Lancashire who belong to a trades union.

534. I want to know how you would distinguish between one set of adult males and another set of adult males?

You would not; you would register the workshop.

535. Supposing you do, what follows?

Inspection.

536. But that would apply equally to the Lancashire men and to the London men?

But inspection would be for abuses. If the abuses were not occurring inspection would not be necessary. I am informed, by the large manufacturers in the tailoring trade, people employing 500 and 600 men, that they would not have the least objection to inspection.

537. But I am asking you about the working hours, not about sanitary inspection. You say that these unfortunate men work 18 or 20 hours; you say that that ought to be prohibited by law in the case of adult males as it is in the case of adult women; I want to know whether you do or do not think that a Lancashire man can take care of himself upon that point?

I do think that a Lancashire man can take care of himself upon that point.

538. Then if a Lancashire man can, do you propose to extend the law to him?

If there is an abuse, I would.

539. How can you tell antecedently whether there is an abuse or not?

That is almost a metaphysical question.

540. It is a very practical question?

If you will give me the same opportunity and time for investigating the Lancashire trade as I have had for this, I will tell you antecedently whether there is an abuse or not in that trade; I know that there is an abuse here.

541. I understand that you would wish that the law prohibiting certain hours of labour beyond a certain maximum should be applied to adult males?

I do not think it would be necessary to apply the clause as to working hours, under which women and girls now work, to men, because I think the registration of workshops would destroy the little men, and would drive the trade into larger hands, and it would be to the interest of these people to treat their men better.

542. Earl of *Derby*.] How would the registration of workshops effect that object?

The registration of workshops would have very much the same effect as it has in the tailoring trade now.

543. What is that?

An inspector can go in any time after the prescribed hours and see that the women and girls are not at work.

544. Lord *Thring*.] Then you would apply to the workshops having adult males the same rules as you apply to workshops having females?

Not all of them.

545. What

545. What do you mean by registering a workshop?
I mean by registering a workshop that a certificate should only be issued to the master of the workshop on certain specific sanitary requirements having been carried out, principally so many cubic feet of air to the workshop.

546. I want to get your opinion about the prohibiting of excessive hours of work; how do you propose to prohibit excessive hours of work amongst the adult males in this trade?
I see no reason why it should not be included in an Act. I think the evil of the Lancashire operative coming under it is a much less evil than the evil that now exists.

547. You would suggest that the hours of male labour should be generally limited as well as female?
I would.

548. Earl of *Derby*.] Starting from that point, namely, that you are prepared to limit the hours of labour of adult males in all occupations, are you prepared to take any steps for insuring their obtaining the same amount of wages as before?
No.

549. As I understand it, these men work in the trade you have been describing 18 hours a day, and obtain with those hours of work a bare subsistence?
A bare subsistence.

550. If you reduce them compulsorily to, say, 12 hours a day, will they continue to earn that subsistence or will they earn less?
I should think that at first the change will be accompanied by great distress whatever change is made, but that gradually, in the course of a short time, the law being applicable to all, prices will re-assert themselves.

551. That is to say, that by preventing a man from working 18 hours a day you will enable him to get for 12 hours work as much pay as he now gets for 18 hours?
Using the term 12 hours generally, I think it would be longer than that; I think if it were 14 or 15 hours even it would not be a very great hardship.

552. Earl of *Onslow*.] I did not quite hear what was your plan for registration of workshops; did you mean that they were to come under the Factory Act, or did you mean a special registration of a new kind?
I referred to a special registration where the certificate or mark of registration was affixed outside the building.

553. What would be the object of the registration?
In order to render the workshops accessible to the visits of the inspectorial authority.

554. What would be the proper definition of a workshop?
The different trades would require different definitions made by practical men.

555. How many people working together in the same room would constitute, in your opinion, a workshop?
Three men.

556. Whether of the same family or not?
Yes.

557. Therefore would you propose to include in the workrooms you would register the private rooms of a family in which they lived?
If they were habitually used for work.

558. And would you propose to charge a fee for registration?
I would charge a stiff fee.

559. What is your idea?
£. 5.

560. Then your object, I presume, would be to crush out the small workshops altogether?
To crush out the small men; I want to drive the knifer back to knifing.

561. And you would make it apply equally to the family workshop?
Absolutely.

562. Lord *Thring.*] Supposing it happens that a family are sewing in their room, a mother and her daughters, is that a workshop?
I think it would be possible to point out a great many hard cases of that sort, and that it would press hardly upon some individuals; but it is a choice of evils.

563. Earl of *Onslow.*] Do you not think that some advantage might accrue from a registration of workrooms at a small fee, in order that one might know what were workrooms, and where they were?
Yes, I think that would be a very great advantage.

564 That would be better than nothing?
Very much better than nothing.

565. Lord *Clinton.*] Would you apply this limitation of hours of adult males to all trades?
If it were a necessity of the case, if it could not be done without; but it seems to me that the practical thing to do would be to apply it to the cases where the absues exist.

566. You would have first to ascertain those cases?
As your Lordships are now ascertaining.

567. Lord *Rothschild.*] You said that you would regulate the hours of labour; if the hours were regulated would it prevent a man from being engaged in more than one trade?
As a matter of fact the precariousness of the employment of which we are speaking to-day is so great that a man never knows when he is going to be employed and when he is going to be idle, and he would be obliged to wait for his work.

568. Earl of *Onslow.*] As your object appears to be to prohibit the existence of these workshops by a heavy licence duty, would your view be equally met if they were absolutely prohibited by Act of Parliament?
Yes.

569. *Chairman.*] Do you consider it of greater importance that the labour of adult males should be limited, or that the workshops should be registered; which of the two is the more important, in your opinion?
I think the registration of workshops is the more important.

570. With that object of inspection?
Yes, if accompanied by the fee.

571. You spoke in your evidence about the women and children working; do they work these long hours?
They do in the shirt trade, enormous hours.

572. But in this trade, do they?
Not in this trade. Very often the wife packs the boots for going to shop, and is up at night late helping, but the employment of women is not usual in the boot trade.

573. You spoke about the exceedingly bad quality of the boots turned out; does not that tend of itself to correct the evils of the trade, because people will not continue to buy goods of that bad quality?
I think that when I quoted the figures of the small increase in the exports, that rather showed that we are suffering very much from not turning out good work.

574. You

574. You think that if better work were the result trade would increase?
I am told so by the colonial merchants.

575. You do not think that any legislative interference would cause loss to the trade?
I think it might temporarily, after the change was made, but only temporarily. Boots, for example, that we are sending to South Africa, and that the Kaffirs are beginning to wear melt in the first shower of rain. If those boots were good the Kaffirs would continue to buy; they are people who are extraordinarily dependent upon fashion, whether in boots or anything else; they would continue to buy boots of that particular brand; but in consequence of their being bad they never go in for those boots again.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

SAMUEL WILDMAN, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

576. *Chairman.*] WHAT is your trade?
Boot finisher.

577. How long have you been in the country?
Ten years.

578. Where did you come from?
I am an Austro-Hungarian.

579. Perhaps you will tell the Committee what your reasons for coming to this country were?
The reason I came was that I could not make a living in my country.

580. What trade were you engaged in there?
I was a teacher.

581. Why did you suppose that you would be any better able to get a living in this country?
I did not know that I should be able to get a living in this country, but some of my friends wrote a letter to my country saying that I could make a better living in England; therefore, I came over to London.

582. Perhaps you will tell the Committee what took place on your arriving; how long you were in getting work, and what kind of work it was?
When I first came over to London I tried for three months to find a situation where i should not have to learn a trade, but, at last, as I saw I could not get anything else, I was obliged to learn a trade, and I went into the employ of a boot and shoe finisher. He told me that in four weeks I could learn the trade, and after the four weeks he said I should be able to earn my living. I went, in the first place, to work at 10 o'clock in the morning; at two o'clock, past midday, I had not had my dinner, and I asked my master if I could not have time to have dinner; he said, "The time to have dinner is between four and five o'clock, and the work will have to be done to go to the shop of the manufacturer." I asked him, "Shall I be obliged to work so long without having dinner?" he gave me the answer that according to the place I should have to work.

583. Earl of *Onslow.*] What do you think he meant by that?
That if I had a good master I could go to dinner any time.

584. *Chairman.*] Till when did you work at night?
Till 12 the first night; at 12 o'clock at night the master told me that if I came in by five o'clock the next morning I should leave off earlier; I came in by five o'clock the next morning, and he kept me until half-past 12 midnight; so I was obliged to work four weeks.

585. Do you mean that you generally worked from five in the morning till past midnight?
Till half-past 12 midnight.

586. Lord *Rothschild.*] This is 10 years ago?
Ten years ago.

587. Lord *Clinton.*] How many days in the week did that last?
Six; Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday. When I came to be a piece worker I went to another master. I asked him for a job; he gave me a job, but he told me that I must still work from five or six o'clock in the morning till 12 midnight. I asked him if I, as a piece worker, must work as long as when I was a day worker at weekly wages, and he told me a piece worker must also work as late, if not he could not have his work done in time to go to the manufacturer, and that if it was a few minutes after time he would not have any more work the next day. After that, when I had been in the trade two years or three years, I inquired if I could not go and see some men of the trades union in the boot and shoe line. At that time there was a general meeting by the trades union in the "Cherry Tree," Kingsland-road. The secretary of the trades union stood on the platform, and he said that the trade was in a very bad condition; but he said, "we will go out on the strike in some places (he mentioned the names), and we will try to get better wages." I asked a friend of mine to explain to me what the secretary said; he explained it to me in the very few words that I have said just now, but afterwards I tried that we should have a little union between us foreigners in the boot and shoe line. It happened that we did constitute a society five years ago. The reason we did it was that we were working 18 and 20 hours a day, and we could not get a living; we thought that by means of that society we should be able to get better wages and work regular hours. As to the wages which we have got still by working from 6 o'clock in the morning till 12 or 1 at midnight, we can earn 4 *s.* or 5 *s.*, or 6 *s.* a day; 30 *s.* a week.

588. Earl of *Onslow.*] Could you tell us how many people there were in this society, and what nationality they were?
We had in the society only Jews; there were a few Englishmen, but very few of them.

589. And how many were there?
There were in at the same time about 200. Then with regard to the 30*s.* which we earn a week, that is only at the time when we are busy, from April till the beginning of June, and sometimes till the beginning of July.

590. *Chairman.*] That is two or three months?
Yes. We reckon it out that taking it all through the year if a man is a very quick workman he can make his wages 15*s.* a week; but if a workman cannot earn 30*s.* a week in the busy time, then it comes to 13*s.* or 14*s.* a week wages to the man all the year round.

591. In what branch of the trade?
Boot finishing. Out of that money we have got to pay our rent and to get our living. I hope you will not press me to give the name of the master from whom I got this boot; but that is the style in which the master gets it from the manufacturer (*handing in a boot*). The next boot shows us what the master (the knifer) did to it till the workman took it in hand, and the workman must bring it so far (*producing another boot*).

592. How many processes does it go through to bring it to that result?
We have got to take the shoe in hand. First we must file the top piece with a file; then we have got to smooth the top-piece with a smooth file; then we have got to sandpaper the heel and the top-piece; then we have got to blacken round with ink. When the boot is black you have to take a burnisher, a large lump of iron, and warm it, and burnish the waist; then we have got to take an edge-iron, and to work round the edge with it; then we have to take a channel-iron, and to warm it, and to put wax on the waist, and, with the channel-iron, to

to work out the waist; then we have got to take a stitch-wheel, and to set round the edge; then we have got to take again the burnisher, to make it warm, and to burnish the heels till the heels shine; then we have to take ink and to black over again the heel, and to burnish it again with a hot iron till it gets a polish; then we have to take wax and put right round upon the heel, and to take a bunker, or dummy, and to work with it till the wax goes right in in the heel; and after that we have got to burnish with the burnisher the top-piece to make it shine, so that every screw of the top-piece shall be able to be seen; and then we must polish over the heel and the top-piece with polish, and set round the heel a seal-wheel; then we have take a heel-iron and to set the crease here round the top-piece; then we have got to scrape the bottoms; when the bottoms are scraped we have got to sandpaper them till the bottom gets smoothed like that (*pointing*); then we have got to sandpaper in pumice-stone or bottom-ball; then we must mark these strips here, as it is on this boot, with a knife, and black the strips, and burnish the channels that they may get shiny; then we have got to put round on the fore part oxalic acid, and set the fore-part iron; then we have got to rub off the wax and to give a little polish on it again, and to clean it over with a rag. Then, when we have got damped bottoms or washed-in bottoms, after the sandpapering we must wash it in with such a kind of stuff that the bottoms should get a shine; and then make the strips and the fore part iron, and then clean it over, and take it off from the last and tack it together. If the manufacturer pays 4 *s.* a dozen the finisher gets 2 *s.*

593. Does one man do all these various processes?
Yes.

594. The same man goes through it all?
Yes.

595. Lord *Archbishop of Canterbury.*] Does one finisher get 2 *s.* for the dozen?

Mr. *Arnold White.*] The 2 *s.* are divided among the finishers; if a man does a dozen himself he gets the 2 *s.*

596. Lord *Rothschild* (to the *Witness*).] How long does it take to finish a boot?

It takes six or seven hours for a quick working man to do a dozen pairs; but we have got some classes of work where the work pays only 3 *s.* a dozen; the working man also has got only 1 *s.* 6 *d.* a dozen for that work. You must take into consideration that a man has to work on a dozen pair of boots seven hours, and cannot earn more than 2 *s.*; then if he works 15 or 16 hours he will have 4 *s.* a day if he makes two dozen; but we have got some classes of work that pays 3 *s.* a dozen and 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a dozen; then the finisher, the working man, has only half of it, and out of what he earns he must get a living for his wife and children.

597. *Chairman.*] Does it take as long to finish a dozen of the cheaper kind as of the better kind?

An hour less for the quickest working man. From those wages which I can earn by that kind of work I must maintain my family; I have got a wife and six children, and I live in one room only; I pay 4 *s.* rent for it. I hope you will consider now how we can possibly get a living from that, and what our circumstances are.

598. Yours is piece-work?
Yes.

599. I do not clearly understand; that means, I suppose, that a certain amount of work is given you to do?

Yes, I have got to do six pair or 10 pair, or a dozen pair each time.

600. You can do that quantity of work as quickly as you can, or you may be as long as you like?

Yes.

601. Then I do not clearly understand how it is that you are bound to work the same number of hours as if you were working for a daily wage?
We are bound to work so many hours if we are to be able to get a living with our children.

602. What I understand is, that the man who employs you gives you a certain quantity of work to do; if you could do it in 12 hours you could go; you could get your money having done that quantity of work; if it takes you 16 hours you have to work 16 hours, and if 18 you have to work 18 hours?
I have to work long hours in order to earn more money. Unless I do the work which is given me by a certain time I am not employed.

603. What is the reason of that?
Because the master receives the work from the wholesale shop who require it to be delivered at once, and unless the master returns it in the proper time the wholesale shop will not employ him again.

604. How many men are working with you?
Four.

605. Under one knifer?
Yes.

606. Is that the general proportion?
Some of them employ four men, some two or three, but some workshops employ eight or nine or ten men; and he has got two knifers he keeps under him.

607. But one knifer can keep up with the work of four men?
Yes, if he is a quick knifer.

608. He is working himself as hard as anybody else?
Yes.

609. I understand that you have been engaged in this work now for about 10 years?
Yes.

610. For the first four weeks after your arrival you worked for nothing?
Yes.

611. And since then you have been able to earn at the rate of about 15 *s.* a week all the year round?
Yes.

612. That is working from about 6 in the morning till 12 midnight?
Yes.

613. Are you obliged to feed yourself in the shop; do you pay for your own dinner?
Yes, but I have a cup of coffee and a cup of tea from the master.

614. But no food?
No; and the breakfast time takes only so long that we working men are obliged to wait till the coffee gets cold and drink it cool; we cannot allow ourselves time to drink warm coffee because the work does not earn the price, and we must earn so much as to get a living for our families.

615. How long do you have for your dinner?
Five or 10 minutes; we have our dinner on the chair by the side where we are working.

616. How many days do you work, six days in the week?
Yes, when it is busy.

617. When it is not busy, what then?
We must wait in the workshop until the boots come from the warehouse.

618. How many hours in the week are you actually at work in bad times?
We must come to the workshop and wait till the work comes home. Sometimes

times the master goes to the shop at 12 dinner time, and comes home by four or five in the afternoon, and the work must be in the next morning, and we are obliged to sit and get on with the work till 12 or one at night.

619. Then you are in the shop all the year round six day a week?
Yes, sometimes the work comes at eight or nine in the morning; sometimes the work comes by 12 o'clock, and sometimes by four or five o'clock in the afternoon, and the next morning the work must be returned finished to the manufactory again.

620. Lord *Rothschild.*] Do you remain in the shop all the year round?
I remain in the shop, but I do not work all the year round.

621. What do you do in the shop when you are not working?
We wait till the master brings the work from the warehouse.

622. Why is it that sometimes in the year the work is so much slacker than at other?
Because the wholesale house wants the work returned in 24 hours.

623. *Chairman.*] I want to get from you a description of the room that you work in?
The room is 4½ yards square with two windows, and about three yards high; there are two gaslights and one heating light, a blow pipe; there are four work men besides the master sitting there.

624. Is the room subject to sanitary inspection?
No inspector comes.

625. Never has been inspected?
Not since the time that I have been employed there; I have been nine months employed there.

626. Earl of *Onslow.*] Are the windows often open, or are they always shut?
Sometimes they are open. When it is warm in the room we open the windows.

627. The workmen have no objection to the windows being open?
No.

628. *Chairman.*] Is the air of the room good for health?
I am not sure about the health on account of the gas, but for a poor man it is comfortable on account of the heat.

629. Do the other men working with you earn about the same wages?
Not all; some of them earn less.

630. The lowest would be what?
In the busy time 24 *s.* to 28 *s.* a week sometimes.

631. And in a slack time?
12 *s.* or 13 *s.*

632. It depends upon the man's being a good workman.
We have some weeks when we have no work at all. In the months of December and January there is no work at all.

633. You earn yourself you say about 15 *s.* a week all the year round?
Yes.

634. How much will the slowest workman earn?
The slowest working man will earn from 10 *s.* to 12 *s.* a week all the year round, or 10 *s.* to 11 *s.*

635. Could you speak any English when you arrived in England?
No.

636. Lord *Thring.*] Do you go to the workshop every day during the month of December when you say there is no work to do?
I am obliged to go there in December and January, because my master gets a small

a small amount of work in from the wholesale manufacturer which has to be finished at once, and he said if I did not go there every day then I should not be employed in the business.

637. Earl of *Onslow.*] What was the amount of your earnings in Hungary before you came over?
I was in a yearly situation. So long as I was in the school as a teacher I had 500 florins a year, 48 *l.*, and I had three sacks of wheat.

638. And your dwelling?
Dwelling and fuel.

639. When you came over 10 years ago was the boot finishing trade in a better or a worse condition than it is now, as far as payment goes?
It was in a little better position than it is now, but not very much.

640. Are you earning less wages now than when you first came over?
Yes.

641. Although you have improved your skill?
Yes.

642. I want to ask you a few questions about the Trade Union Society that you belonged to; how long did that society last?
Two years.

643. Why did it break down?
The first one lasted nine months, and the second was a society that we had together with the masters; that society lasted very nearly 12 months.

644. And did it result in raising the price of the work?
Of course we could get more wages if we had a society.

645. And why do you not find it possible to have a society?
We have got now a society also, but very few members in the society. We have got in our society now about 68 members, all working men.

646. And do the members of that society get better wages than those who are not members of the society?
Not yet.

647. Do you hope to?
We hope to. If our society were to increase then we could get more wages.

648. Do you think it would be difficult to get more wages unless you get in almost the whole of the working men into the society?
If all our working men would be union men then no one would work under price; but as all our working men are not union men, one shop does not pay the work so good as others, and then the other manufacturer says, "If he can get his work done at that price, so can I mine." Then if we ask our master for better wages, and the master asks the manufacturer for better wages, he says he can get in the work from foreign parts cheaper than he can get it done in England; and if we tell him we cannot do the work for the same price, he says, "I shall put out the work to other finishers."

649. That is to say those who are not members of a Trade Union Society take work at a less price; they are obliged to do so?
Yes.

650. And therefore they break down the whole wages?
Yes.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

13*th April* 1888.

MAYER FEILWEIL, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows (his evidence being interpreted):

651. Lord *Rothschild.*] WHERE do you come from?
From Russia.

652. From which part?
From Odessa.

653. Why have you left Odessa?
I was a soldier for five years; I am married, and have left my wife in Odessa. I have no children. I was a soldier. I went from Odessa to Kieff to work there, and the authorities at Kieff would not let me work there as I was not born at Kieff, but at Odessa. I came overland; I worked my way to Cracow, and from there to Breslau, and from there to Hamburgh, and from there to here. I came over here with a brother; we went to friends in Whitechapel.

654. When did you come?
A fortnight ago; I came over at Passover.

655. How many came with you?
Eight persons.

656. All men?
Two women and six men.

657. Have you any friends here?
I had a fellow countryman here.

658. How have you lived?
I got no living.

659. Who has helped you?
I was told when I came here that my countrymen were well off, and I found that they were very badly off, 11 or 12 working in one place.

660. And they told you to go to your countrymen?
I was told so; I am living in Whitechapel now.

661. What did you do when you came here first; where did you go?
When I arrived I went to a countryman, and my countryman lived very poorly. My countryman wrote to me that if I was so badly off and persecuted in Russia, I had better come over here.

662. Earl of *Onslow.*] Did you come over principally in the hope of earning wages or to escape persecution?
I came here because when I had done serving in the army I went to Kieff, and the authorities turned me out of the town; and I was turned out of one town after another, and I found a letter from my people to come over here.

663. Lord *Rothschild.*] How are you living now?
I am learning to be a shoemaker.

664. Who gives you money?
I live with my people; where I am learning the trade they give me breakfast and tea, and my country people find the rest of it.

665. *Chairman.*] Had you any means when you arrived here?
I have not earned a living.

666. How did you obtain the money to come over here; who gave it you?
It cost 150 roubles. My wife's mother made up a sum for me and all my relatives; they gave me 15 *l.*

667. I want to know whether you had any means when you arrived; how much of that 15 *l.* was remaining over when you came to London?
I had 3 *s.* when I arrived here; I got off the ship with 3 *s.* in my pocket.

668. Did you know any trade when you landed?
I was a sugar baker in Russia, and would have worked in a sugar factory here, only I cannot speak English, and can only work with those people who speak my own language.

669. What trade are you learning now?
I am learning the boot-finishing trade.

670. When do you expect to be able to earn wages?
They have promised to teach me the work in a month, and then, if I earn sufficient money, I may send for my wife. I shall not send for her till I earn sufficient money.

671. Is the master you are working for one of your friends?
I am working with a countryman.

672. You have been here a fortnight; have you been working the whole time with him?
I came over at Passover; I came to my countryman, and spent some time at the Shelter, and since then I have been working.

673. What hours have you been working?
From 6 in the morning till 12 at night.

674. Do you live in the same place where you work?
No.

675. How many people work in the shop?
Four persons, including the master. My mother was at Kieff with three children. I heard my mother was in Kieff, so I went there. When I came to Kieff I found my mother was turned out. Then I registered myself at one of the police agencies, and I told them that I had been sent to Kieff. Then I asked the serjeant or the chief inspector where I could go in the town, and he told me I must not live there; I said, "Why must I not live here; I am a soldier." He said, "Soldiers are not worth anything in this town, you must go." So I asked him, "Where shall I go?" He said, "Where you like." Then I went to Radywill, where I found my mother. When I came there I found that they had turned my mother out from that place as well, so I returned to Odessa. Then I found my mother and wife there; but, as I could not support my wife, I could not live with her. When I left the army they took everything away from me, and I walked about in a ragged condition, and in that condition I went to Odessa. Where I could have made a living they would not let me, and where they would have allowed it I could not make a living. I then asked my mother, "What shall we do?" My mother told me that in London she heard that they would not persecute me as much as they did there; so they collected the money and sent me over here. I have a brother here in London as well.

676. Earl of *Onslow.*] Did you bind yourself to the master for any particular length of time?
I gave my employer 5*s.* I pawned something in order to give him the 5*s.* I have to work for a month for nothing in order to learn the trade.

677. *Chairman.*] What kind of food do you get?
When I came over here I went to the Shelter for 14 days, and the 14 days expired yesterday. I have had nothing to eat since yesterday; I do not know where I shall get anything to eat.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

13*th April* 1888.

SOLOMON HIRSCH, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows (his evidence being interpreted):

678. *Chairman.*] How long have you been here?
About six months.

679. Where do you come from?
From Kevic, three miles from Kovna.

680. Why did you leave Kevic?
I did not want to serve the Russian Czar in the army.

681. What were you there?
An agricultural labourer.

682. What induced you to come to England?
I ran away, having no mother or father there.

683. Why to England?
They all came here, and I came with them.

684. Do you mean that people from the same neighbourhood came?
Yes, some of my countrymen came with me.

685. How did you get the money to get here, and how did you get here?
I made a collection among my friends.

686. How much did it cost you?
It cost me 15 roubles to come here, 30*s.*

687. By what route?
I came to Hamburgh with the ship, and from Hamburgh to London by ship. Ten men and eight women came with me.

688. When you left home had you any idea what you were going to do when you got here?
I had no idea when I came to London what I would do, but I had the address of a countryman of mine, and I went direct to my countryman.

689. Was the money paid for your passage raised by your own friends?
Yes.

690. How much money did you have on landing?
Four shillings I had in my pocket when I went to my countryman.

691. What did you do then?
When I came to my countryman he started me at once to work; my countryman is a boot finisher.

692. Did he take you into the same shop as himself?
He took me to the shop with him, and took me under his care. My countryman was working for a sub-contractor, and he took me under his care and taught me the particular branches.

693. Did you earn any wages the first week?
He gave me nothing the first week, but he gave me food, and he gave me a shilling for the second week with food.

694. What do you earn now?
I do not work for my countryman now; I earn 8*s.* a week. I earned 5*s.* a week by my countryman; he would not give me any more work afterwards, so I had to leave, and now I earn 8*s.*

695. Earl of *Onslow.*] Is that a weekly wage?
I get 8*s.* the whole of the week whether I work or do not. I start on Sunday morning, commencing at seven and work up till 10; and the other days I start at

at six and work right up till 10 as well, but on Thursday I work up to 12 o'clock, and Friday come again at 6, then I work till sunset.

696. *Chairman.*] And earn 8 *s.* a week?
Yes.

697. Did you go to the Shelter on arriving?
No, I did not go to the Shelter; I went with my countrymen.

698. Do you know at all what became of the men and women that were with you?
No, I do not.

699. What food do you get?
I receive 8 *s.* a week, and buy my own food.

700. What food?
Only bread, tea, and coffee; no meat, no fish.

701. How far are you from the place where you work?
I only live a few minutes walk from the place where I work.

702. What do you pay for your lodgings?
I pay 2 *s.* a week for lodging, and there are five persons sleeping in the same room; there are women in the same room; I do not sleep in a bed, I sleep on the floor.

703. How many work in the place where you are working?
Four men altogether, including the master.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Martis, 17° *Aprilis*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of CANTERBURY.
Earl of ONSLOW.
Lord CLINTON.
Lord CLIFFORD of CHUDLEIGH.
Lord FOXFORD (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord THRING.

LORD KENRY (EARL OF DUNRAVEN AND MOUNT-EARL), IN THE CHAIR.

SAMUEL WILDMAN, having been re-called, is further Examined, as follows:

704. Earl of *Onslow*.] I WAS asking you, if you recollect, when the Committee adjourned upon the last occasion, as to the reasons why you were unable to continue the existence of the trade societies which had been formed?

Because our men do not earn enough wages to get their living, and they are afraid sometimes to come to the meetings. If the master who employs them, or the manufacturer, knows that a man is a society man, a union man, he will get discharged; and the moment the master ascertains the fact, the man is immediately replaced. Not only do the knifers discharge the finishers if they belong to a union, but the manufacturers themselves require the deposit of a sum of money from the knifers as surety against a strike in the execution of an order.

Mr. *Arnold White*.] The witness means that the manufacturers, having large export orders to carry out, insure themselves against the risk of failure from strike by demanding from the knifers a deposit of a sum of money as security against their men striking.

705. Earl of *Onslow* (to the *Witness*).] Do you find any difficulty amongst the men on account of your not all speaking the same language?

They are only Jews, but some of them speak English, and almost all of them speak a jargon.

706. Is there any difficulty in keeping the union together because the men speak different languages?

We speak two languages at our unions.

707. Do you find the same difficulty as was found in the building of the Tower of Babel?

Those that speak the jargon also join our society.

708. But is there a difficulty in increasing the union because of that?

Yes, there is.

709. And do you find it possible to get men to join your union who have only just landed in England?

We should find it possible if your Lordships would help us. We should like that an Act should be passed by Parliament that we should work only regular hours; then every one of them would belong to our union.

710. Will the greeners join the union?
Yes, they would if we were to have short hours.

711. Is it difficult to make the union strong because of the greeners always coming over, because they go and take the work under price?
Yes, that makes it difficult to make the union strong.

712. *Chairman.*] What is the name of the society?
The Jewish Journeymen Working-men Boot Finisher's Society.

713. What are the objects of the society?
One object of the society is that if one of our members gets ill he shall be assisted during the time when he is not able to follow his employment, and another object is to protect the men, that the manufacturers should not reduce the price of the work as has been done up till now.

714. In fact, you want to keep up the rate of your wages?
Yes.

715. That you can only do if you manage to get all the working men into the union?
Yes.

716. And that would be useless if you have greeners coming over here who are obliged to work for any wages they can get?
Yes.

717. Earl of *Onslow.*] You said that you thought you could form these unions if Parliament passed a law restricting the hours to something very much less than they are now?
Yes.

718. Would you be prepared to accept a proportionate restriction in the amount of your wages?
As to the amount of the wages, it could be done so far better, that we would have work regular all through the year, instead of what we do now, working one week daily 18 or 19 hours, we would work 12 hours a day, and then we could have very nearly two weeks, where now we only have one week.

719. You think that you would get the work more evenly divided over the whole of the year?
Yes; we are piece-workers; we do not get weekly wages.

720. *Chairman.*] You told us that when trade was bad you sometimes had no work to do for a number of days?
Yes.

721. Then you get an order which has to be done at once?
Yes.

722. So that you have to work perhaps 18 hours a day till it is finished?
Yes.

723. How do you account for that; I mean how do you account for the fact that there may be several days, and perhaps a week or two, without your getting any orders, and then when you do get an order it must be finished at once?
The irregularity and absence of system is in the manufacturers; it is not in consequence of the order being one that has to be finished at a certain time, but it is in consequence of the manner in which the manufacturers give it. The manufacturer has always got his order a day or two before the time when he gives it out to the finisher; but it is usual that if the knifer goes to the shop of the manufacturer at 12 o'clock, dinner time, the manufacturer keeps him there till four or five o'clock, past midday, and then he gives him out four or five dozen of boots to finish, and he tells him that he must have them in the next morning by 9 or 10 o'clock. That is why we are compelled to work so late, and the work is therefore irregular.

724. Why

724. Why does the manufacturer do that?
The reason why he does it is that he knows that if one will not bring him in the work the next morning he can discharge him, and put in his place another.

725. But what I want to know is, what good does it do to the manufacturer to keep back the orders in that way?
He can get his order done cheaper and better. The manufacturer gets paid earlier if the goods are delivered earlier.

726. Have you any objection to tell the Committee what you pay for your lodgings?
Four shillings a week.

727. For how many rooms?
For one room.

728. Have you a wife?
A wife and six children. And this 4 *s.* I am not able to pay regularly. I can send you in my rent book to show you that I am four weeks behind.

729. Do you know how many people live in the same house?
In the building about 100.

730. Do you know the size of your room?
About four and a half yards or five yards square, and two windows, something like that.

731. Have you ever measured it?
No; but I think it will be very near that.

732. Did you hear the evidence of two "greeners" who were examined here the other day of the name of Hirsch and Feilweil; were you here when they gave their evidence?
Yes.

733. From your knowledge, was their evidence peculiar, or are there many others in the same circumstances?
There are many others in the same circumstances.

734. You think that they are general average specimens of the "greeners" as they arrive in this country?
They are mostly like them.

735. Now, from your knowledge, do you consider your position as a finisher to be superior to that of most finishers, or to be about the same; are you better off than most of them?
I am about the same as others.

736. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] If you had shorter hours, would you work for smaller wages; should you wish to have shorter hours and smaller wages. I mean if you have work all the year, would you wish to work shorter hours and have smaller wages?
Not smaller wages than we have got now.

737. The same wages, shorter hours, and work all the year; that is what you want?
We would expect to have more wages than we have got now, because regularly through the year a quick working man can only make 15 *s.* a week, and a slow one 12 *s.*, or at the most 13 *s.* a week; the father of a family of five or six children, I am sure, cannot get a living on 14 *s.* or 15 *s.* a week; I should say 16 *s.*

738. *Chairman.*] Have you sat in many workshops?
Yes.

739. Are they all about the same as the one you are now working in?
No, some of the workshops are smaller; they are about two yards square and

about a yard or a yard and a half high, and only one window, and three or four working men sit in that room.

740. Were any of them inspected by the sanitary inspectors while you were working in them?
No. I have shown Mr. White the workshops, and he knows in what state they are.

741. Have there been women or children working in any of the workshops you have worked in?
Only men.

742. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Would you be content to work every day in the year for 12 hours, getting the same price for finishing a dozen pair of boots; if you could get work every day for 12 hours, and the same price for a dozen pair of boots, would you consider that you were then better off?
No, we should not; because we have got now boots paid at 2 *s.* and 1 *s.* 9 *d.* a dozen, and the working men have got only the half of that; and in the case of a dozen boots, 2 *s.* boots, it must take the working man at least four hours to do a dozen, and for those four hours he has got a shilling, and how can he keep up a family by the wages he can earn from that?

743. Not if he got work every day?
No.

744. Lord *Sandhurst.*] You came over 10 years ago?
Yes.

745. Were wages higher 10 years ago than they are now?
Yes, they were. I could earn in the same time regularly from 25 *s.* to 28 *s.* a week.

746. Lord *Thring.*] Why have wages lowered, in your opinion?
The wages are lowered because there are so many in the trade in our boot-finishing trade; they go into the shop of the manufacturer and take out the work cheaper than others.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

CHARLES SOLOMON, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

747. *Chairman.*] WHAT is your business?
Boot finisher.

748. The same as the witness who has been last examined?
No; I am a master, what is called a knifer.

749. Are you an official of the masters' union?
Yes: I am secretary of the Jews' association.

750. What is the title of it?
The Jewish Mutual Boot Finishers' and Lasters' Trade and Benefit Society.

751. That is a masters' society?
Yes.

752. What are the objects of it?
The object of it is this: we have been crushed down by our wages very much indeed this last few years, and I found that there was a trade union in England, and we were very much blamed because it was said that the Jews were working against the trade union by cutting the wages down, and at the same time it was not our fault at all; it is the fault of the new comers who come in, flooding the trade, and that was really the reason of it. After the manufacturers taking such a great advantage of us, we started making this union to protect

protect ourselves against the manufacturers, that the wages should not continue to be reduced week after week, and to protect our members; when they are ill they receive 12 *s.* 6 *d.* a week.

753. When you speak of the reduction of wages, I do not clearly understand; is it not the case that the manufacturers put out their work to you?
Yes, they give it out to us.

754. At so much a quantity?
So much a dozen.

755. That is what you mean by reduction of wages, the reduction in the price they give per dozen?
Yes.

756. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] You said there was a reduction of wages week after week?
It has been reduced; the wages in some shops have been reduced 30 or 40 per cent., since the last three or four years.

757. *Chairman.*] How do you account for that?
I would not go and work under price; but with regard to the new comers, they are only in the trade a year or two years, when they go and do it. When they come over here they know no trade at all. As the two greeners stated last week, one was an agriculturist and the other a sugar baker. A man learns a trade in four weeks' time, and he gets in the same position as me, and this man will never be able to ask for his price, because he did not learn his trade properly.

758. I do not understand how that affects the price at which the manufacturers put out their goods to you?
If I were to receive this morning three or four dozen boots, for which I received last week 4 *s.* 6 *d.*, and were offered this week 4 *s.* a dozen, if I refused them there are plenty of people behind me who would be glad of them.

759. Do you mean plenty of masters?
Masters. They will only be here 12 months, or 18 months, or two years, and then they become masters as well.

760. Then, in fact, what you call the rate of wages, what I prefer to call the rate at which the goods are put out to you, is brought down by competition?
Yes.

761. By the competition principally of new men who have been in the country only a short time?
Yes.

762. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] Do you mean that those two men whom we saw the other day might be masters in a couple of years?
I am quite positive they will.

763. And that they will have greeners under them?
I have not the least doubt. If such people become masters they go into the shop and do not ask any price whatever; as soon as the work is given to them they are glad of it, and do it; they have no idea about asking a price for work. A man who has served in the army wants to be a mechanic in four weeks' time. Consider whether it is possible that a man can learn a trade in four weeks and become a mechanic.

764. *Chairman.*] Are most of the masters in your union?
They are all masters.

765. Have you had any effect in keeping up prices?
Yes, we were out on strike the whole winter, 13 weeks.

766. Is it true that the wages of men working for you have gone down during the last eight or 10 years?
Most decidedly; if I employ a man under me, when I take out a dozen pair

of boots at 5 *s.*, the man gets for his labour 2 *s.* 6 *d.*, and I have to knife that work and find everything that is wanted for the work, and I have to fetch it from the shop and take it back, and for that I have half of the money.

767. Your contention is, that if you can keep up the price at which the goods are put out to you, the men who work under you will get better wages also?

Yes; if the master gets a dozen pair of boots for 5 *s.*, and the next week it is reduced 6 *d.*, if he finishes two dozen pairs of boots a day he loses 6 *d.*, but if he can keep the prices up he will have at the same time 3 *s.* more in the week to clear his rent.

768. Has the proportion that the masters have paid to the men under them been the same during your knowledge of the trade?

I have been 20 years in the trade, and it has never been altered between the master and the men; it is between the manufacturer and the master that it lies.

769. Have the men made any efforts to get a larger proportion?

This is our regular way of working; we never make any difference. It is the half price that they receive, and they never ask for any more; they know they have to receive a half of it.

770. Now would you explain to the Committee about that half, what your expenses are, what proportion of what you get for the goods goes to you, the master, and what to the men?

I have to knife, to work myself, and I have to keep up a workshop and firing and gas, and grindery as it is called, the stuff that we use for the work, ink, and so on, and tools, and to shop the work and take the work back to shop; and this is what we receive a half of it for.

771. What is the price which you get for goods at present?

It is all different prices now that this common work has been introduced into the trade; it should never have been in existence. We receive as little as 2 *s.* 3 *d.* and 1 *s.* 9 *d.* and 1 *s.* 6 *d.* for a dozen; such work has never been made or finished till this last few years, since the new comers have been employed in the trade.

772. Have you any knowledge of the number of greeners coming into this country?

The only day I have to judge of that is the Sabbath, when I see them walking about; but I am always at work in the week, and I could not give any account of that.

773. Do you get a great many people applying to you for work?

No.

774. Supposing you discharged a man, would you have any difficulty in supplying his place?

No; I am sorry to say there are a good many of them about the place, as well unemployed as employed, because there are so many of them that are going about. I do not know what they do. The first opportunity they have to learn the trade they run into the finishing or the lasting.

775. Do they come over in large numbers?

That I could not say.

776. I want to get at this, whether these greeners, as they are called, coming over to this country, has any great effect in reducing the price of wages, both to you masters, and consequently to the men who work under you?

I do not take any advantage of a greener when he comes to work for me; in fact, I could not employ a greener. I cannot take a greener into work, as I do not finish myself single-handed; only these "greener" masters, they work this common low work, and they are the people who teach these greeners.

777. Do you think that you would be better off or worse off if there were fewer greeners, or more greeners, or no greeners at all?

I should

I should say if there were no greeners at all I should be better off, a great deal.

778. How many men do you employ?
Three.

779. You work yourself?
Yes, I have to get the work ready for those men.

780. And you work as hard as the men under you?
Yes, I do the same hours as they do, except when I am not in the workshop, when I go to the shop to shop my work.

781. What time do you begin work in the morning?
When we are busy we are obliged to do as many hours as possible. Years ago the manufacturers were obliged to prepare themselves with a good stock, and they were obliged to work in the winter as well as in the summer. A week before Christmas they closed up the warehouses, and they took stock. In a week after Christmas they opened the warehouse, and they continued keeping on working the whole year. Now they are so independent of the working men that they do not care whether any man sticks up that they should employ him during the winter; it is only the three months from April up to August; that is the three months when we have to work; and we have to work jolly hard to provide for ourselves when the bad time comes, and we cannot provide ourselves with enough.

782. What hours do you work?
As much as 17 or 18 hours a day.

783. You mean during the busy time?
Yes, during the busy time.

784. You need not answer this question if you do not like; what can you earn?
I can earn as much as my workmen; what my team of workmen earn I earn myself.

785. Earl of *Onslow*.] The three together, do you mean?
Yes, the three together.

786. *Chairman*.] How long have you been in the finishing trade?
Twenty years.

787. Did you come over here as what is commonly called a greener?
Yes.

788. Perhaps you would give the Committee a little account of what you did when you came over, and how you arrived at your present position?
I was in a very good position when I came over here. I had a brother over here, and I am sorry I found him working as a finisher; I wish I had found him a rich man. I came over and found him a finisher, and he taught me the same trade.

789. How long were you before you became a knifer?
I was working for my brother seven months for board and lodging, and he taught me the trade perfectly well during that seven months; and after seven months I started work on piecework, the same as I employ men now, and the first week after I started work on piecework I earned 25 *s*.

790. When was that; about 19 years ago?
Yes, and I worked very hard, the same time as we do now, and I worked for my brother about two years, and then I started working for myself.

791. You had made enough money in that time to start on your own account?
You do not want to put in such a lot of capital for starting as a master; it is only a matter of about a couple of pounds to buy tools altogether; he can start work, and become a master with that.

792. Have you not got to give any security to the shops?
Yes, the security of a householder; no money.

793. Are there any masters who do not work at all themselves, who employ knifers?
Yes, there are some of them, they employ a lot of sweaters; and this is what was explained by Mr. Arnold White. A machine has been introduced into the trade; it is called a spokeshave; it is a machine which pares up the foreparts. Before this machine was introduced into the trade, unless a man was a practical bootmaker, he could not become a master so quickly; he had to knife up his work with a knife.

794. Now what I asked you was, whether there are many masters who are not themselves knifers?
The masters are knifers; some of them are no finishers at all; they cannot finish a boot at all, only knife up.

795. I mean are there many masters who do no work at all themselves, but merely superintend?
All the master has got to do sometimes is to sock the work and clean it, and take it to shop and bring the work again.

796. We have been told that orders come in very irregularly from the manufacturers, that there may be no orders for some days or weeks, and that then an order comes in and must be finished at once, and the men have to work for 16 or 17 hours a day; is that the case?
Yes; the manufactures were obliged formerly to prepare themselves with heavy stocks for the season, but they do not do it now, because they are quite independent of the men; they have got so many men about them who would come and apply for work any time when the order comes in from the warehouse and shopkeeper; they can get it done at any time.

797. During the slack time when work is bad, you may perhaps have nothing to do for three or four days?
Yes.

798. And then you get an order perhaps on the Thursday, which must be finished by Thursday night or Friday morning?
Yes.

799. Why is it that that order is not given to you say on the Monday, so as to be spread over the whole week?
I suppose it is not convenient enough for the manufacturer, where he has not got the order in. I said before to your Lordships that the shopkeepers where obliged formerly to give the orders in time to get the work done, because the work was not done so quickly; there were not so many in the trade. Now there are so many in the trade that if the shopkeeper gives the order, in two days he can get a gross of boots done.

800. As I understand you, the manufacturer, the shopkeeper, keeps no stock?
No.

801. And therefore as soon as he gets the order he must get it done at once?
Yes; if the manufacturer were not provided with so many men, and if so many working people were not taught this trade, I reckon that the boot line would be the best trade in the country; only the evil is that there are so many packed in the trade.

802. Did you hear the evidence of the two greeners the other day?
Yes.

803. Do you consider those to be fair average specimens?
Perhaps you will listen to an explanation that I will give you. If I have a boy that has just left school, and if I want to apprentice him to a proper trade, I must apprentice him for seven years to learn the trade, and the first year the boy

boy only receives 2*s.* 6*d.* a week; some parents are better off and some worse off; I have to keep that boy for 2*s.* 6*d.* a week, and find him clothes and everything else; when he comes out of school he is 14 years of age, and at the end of his apprenticeship he is 21 years of age. Now when a man comes over like this man, 36 years old (no doubt that man who was here on Friday was that age), and he comes over here with no money, nothing to support himself with, and he learns a trade in four weeks, how much prospect does he really expect.

804. What I asked you was whether these two men were average specimens, whether most of the greeners who come over come over in the same destitute condition, without money and without any knowledge of any trade?

The young fellow looked in a very bad state; if he were to soak in ink for a fortnight he ought not to look so. I am sure that soap and water is very cheap in England. After he has done his day's work I am sure he can find means to wash himself.

805. I was not thinking of his personal appearance at all; I want to know whether, in your opinion, greeners, when they come over, are as destitute, have as little money, as little means of supporting themselves, as those two men who were examined here?

Yes, I expect they all come about the same.

806. You said just now that these two greeners would probably become knifers; that is, masters, in a year or two?

I am positive of that.

807. One of them gave it in evidence that he was earning 8*s.* a week after being here six months, and the other man was earning nothing at all; now, I think you told us that you took three or four years, or more, before you became a knifer, and that you were earning 25 *s.* a week?

Yes, before I became a knifer, after being apprenticed seven months.

808. If it took you three or four or five years at 25 *s.* a week to become a knifer, why do you think that this man who was examined before the Committee the other day, who was earning only 8 *s.* a week, is going to become a knifer in two or three years?

I was mentioning that those machines have only been introduced into the trade about 14 years. Nobody could become a master formerly unless he was a practical bootmaker; now, when they learn a little bit of the machine there are low-paying shops in the East-end, where the manufacturer is very glad to employ them when he would not me, because I am too much of an Englishman. I would not take the work at that low price.

809. How many men are usually employed by a knifer?

If I like to employ four I can very well manage for them; it is according as a man learns his trade; if he is a quick workmen, he can very well manage four; I am very quick at my trade; some can only employ two or three.

810. And I suppose four is the utmost?

Yes, four is the utmost; that must be a very quick workman.

811. Do you consider it a fair division of profit that the master should take one-half and the other half be divided among four?

This is not a new rule; it has been so arranged for the many years that I have been in the trade.

812. Still, that is not an answer to my question; I did not ask whether it is a new or old rule, but whether it is a fair rule?

This is my business; if I open a business, suppose my business should carry me 4 *l.*; then another man may open a little business that will carry him 2 *l.*; and many open a business to earn 10 *l.*, and if I can manage to make for 10 *l.* that is my profit; and I do believe some masters do earn that by keeping on those large workshops; but I never try to do that; I always work myself, and I am sure I work very hard to earn that money; and your Lordships must

 excuse

excuse if, when you put the question to me whether it is fair, I answer that that is my business.

813. I suppose competition presses very severely upon you; I mean upon all masters?
Yes.

814. What is the size of your workshop?
The gentleman is here who has seen my workshop; it is a very large workshop; I cannot always live there. At the present time I employ three men, and have got a very large workshop. I might have to go out from there and move into another workshop, and very likely I shall not have such a convenient workshop as that. But to take this matter in hand we want that the trade shall improve, that is, that they shall not be able to learn the trade in so short a time. My opinion is, that the workshops should be built by the manufacturers, and that we should all work in them; that will soon improve the trade more than anything else; that would be the best at once for the trade.

815. You would be in favour of large workshops?
The workshops should be built by the manufacturers, and the work done on the manufacturer's premises.

816. Then you would not object to a large, or a tolerably large, registration fee being charged?
If we worked out in large workshops of the manufacturers, this sweating system could not be carried on as it is now.

817. You would not object to that?
Not in the least.

818. What would become of you under those circumstances?
I am a workman, I can finish and knife; if I had as many pairs of boots as I could finish and knife I would be very well satisfied, if the majority of them were not able to work on a different system.

819. Lord *Thring.*] Do you work with the knife now, or with these new tools you have spoken of?
With the new tools.

820. And can you do the work quicker with the new tools than with the knife?
When I started working at first I was obliged to work with the knife; the tools were not introduced yet; then I could only knife and finish a dozen pair; but the price was 5 *s.* for the dozen pairs of boots, that I received for 17 years, now they are finished and knifed for 3 *s.*; it is 2 *s.* reduction on the very same work.

821. The question I asked was whether you used the new tools?
I do.

821. Can you knife more boots with the new tools than you could with the old, in the same time?
I do not think I could employ one man with the knife formerly, with the new tools I could employ four.

823. Why?
Because it is not mechanical at all. Any one so soon as he wishes to be a knifer learns it in four weeks.

824. As I understand you, you use the new tools, and your men use the new tools?
No, the men that work under me are only finishing; I am paring up the work ready for them to finish it.

825. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] Do you mean this; the knifer with the machine can keep three men going at finishing?
Yes.

826. If

826. If he has to knife with the knife he can only keep one man going finishing?
Yes; and then he must be a practical bootmaker.

827. But with the machine he can knife fast enough to employ three or four men in finishing?
Yes.

828. Lord *Thring.*] Then the new tools are an advantage to you?
It is a great advantage to a trades-union man who gets a second class price.

829. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] But it enables very bad workmen to get on almost as well as very good workmen?
Certainly.

830. Earl of *Onslow.*] But if the wages fall in consequence of the number of greeners that are in the market, and who are prepared to take low wages, does not the margin of profit to the master become greater?
But the workmen have to suffer a great deal; the masters might be able to earn more; he does if he takes another man; the profits become larger to him, but the prices of the workmen are still reduced and he cannot finish any more. He might be able to finish two dozen or 18 pair; but the workmen is as great a sufferer as the master.

831. Does not the master benefit by the fall of wages?
Yes, if he can employ more men.

832. Lord *Thring.*] Did I not understand that you are a master?
Yes.

833. And you profit by the new tools?
Yes.

834. And you profit by the greeners coming over?
No; I would not take a greener to teach if he would pay me double money; I only employ men at piecework; the man must know his trade and be a mechanical man.

835. I understand that the greener, by the use of these new tools, can do as well now as an experienced workman, like yourself some years ago did with the knife?
They can only learn by those greener masters that have not been very long over here; and so soon as a man learns the paring up with a new machine he becomes a master, and that man becomes the commonest man in the trade, and he just looks up those greeners that have just come over and takes them on to work with him.

836. And he does bad work?
Very bad.

837. Earl of *Onslow.*] Is it not the fact, that in the trade the wages of men employed by masters such as you are falling?
If I were to say that it was through me I do not think that would be the truth. The truth is, that there are so many that come over, and so many learning the trade, that the manufacturer is quite independent of the men; he can get as many as he wants.

838. And therefore the wages are falling?
Yes.

839. And the masters, such as yourself, are benefited by the fall in the wages?
We have the benefit; but we have to work a great deal more to get our wages, the same as the workmen.

840. But if you have to pay the people you employ less wages, and if you get the same prices for the boots, you naturally make a greater profit?
Yes, those who employ a lot of men certainly do.

841. *Chairman.*] But do you get the same price for the goods. Lord Onslow asked you whether, if you have to pay less wages, you do not benefit by that if you get the same price now for the goods as you did formerly; I ask you whether you do get the same price now?

There has a great reduction been made; some shops have made a reduction of between 30 and 40 per cent., which a gentleman in this room has been investigating and will prove; I believe it is correct.

842. What is the reduction in wages; is it 20, 30, or 40 per cent.; not the reduction in your profits, I mean, but in the wages you pay to the men under you?

I never made any distinction in the prices between me and my men. When the manufacturer pays me 4 *s.* the man gets 2 *s.*, and I have 2 *s.*

843. And has the amount of earnings that the men under you make been reduced, say in the last six or eight years, by 20 or 30 per cent., or how much?

The workmen are the great sufferers this last few years, because the prices are so reduced; the masters keep on reducing the prices. When they finished two dozen pairs of boots at 5 *s.*, they had earned 5 *s.* in a day; now when we have to do it for 3 *s.* 6 *d.*, look at the wages the men have got.

844. The prices have been reduced to you about 60 per cent., and the workmen under you have suffered to the same extent?

Most decidedly; I believe they suffer more than me.

845. Earl of *Onslow.*] Have the contract prices fallen more than the price of wages, or has the price of wages fallen more than the prices of the contract; has the rate of the manufacturer's prices fallen in a greater proportion than the rate that you pay to the men, or that the masters pay to their men?

Last week, say I received 4 *s.* 6 *d.* per dozen, the men received 2 *s.* 3 *d.*, and suppose this week I came in with my work and the manufacturer says, "It will be only 4 *s.*," then the man has lost 3 *d.* already.

846. Earl of *Limerick.*] You do not pay your men wages, it is piecework?

It is piecework; if it is 5 *s.* a dozen, the man gets 2½ *d.* per pair.

847. Lord *Clinton.*] If the greener masters do bad work, how do they compete with you who do good work?

Take that greener who was here on Friday; he has got to work for four weeks for nothing, and after the four weeks I do not think he can become a piece worker, but the master gives him 6 *s.* or 8 *s.* a week, and he works with him and makes a profit out of him.

848. But speaking of the manufacturer who employs a greener master to work for him, why does he employ him if he is a bad workman?

He will have the benefit out of him; when he would have to pay for a proper workman 5 *s.*, that greener will do it for 2 *s.* 6 *d.*

849. And he will do it well enough?

If he does not, he makes him do it.

850. He gets the work done well enough, in short, by the greener master?

Yes.

851. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] The masters have gained by the improvement in tools?

Yes, a great deal.

852. Because they can undertake so much more work?

Yes.

853. But the men have not gained at all?

No.

854. The masters have gained by machinery, and the men have lost by it?

Yes.

855. Is

855. Is the work good that is put into those 4 *s.* a dozen boots?
Yes, capital goods boots.

856. Are the materials good?
Very good boots.

857. What sort of materials are they for the boots for which you get 2 *s.* 3 *d.* and 1 *s.* 9 *d.* and 1 *s.* 6 *d.* a dozen?
They are very bad boots; that is, the commonest boot.

858. And is the work worse?
Yes.

859. Then how is it that it suits the manufacturers to have the work done so much worse?
I could hardly give you any answer on behalf of the manufacturers; no doubt they get some profit out of it

860. What do those boots sell for, which you have spoken of, for which you get 2 *s.* 3 *d.* and 1 *s.* 9 *d.* a dozen?
One shilling and three-pence a pair, or 1 *s.* 2 *d.*; we only know what we get for our labour.

861. Why do you have three workmen if you could keep four going; it would pay you better?
I am not very old; I am only 37, and I have been overworked; I have worked very hard in my day, and could not work so hard now as I should have to do to keep on four men.

862. Lord *Sandhurst.*] You say, supposing one man leaves you, you have no difficulty in getting another?
No; whoever likes to employ those new comers can get them by bushels.

863. But the better class of men?
The better class of workmen is not so easily got; he does not change about so much; every master is glad to have a good workman.

864. There are not so many good workmen unemployed?
No.

865. Does a greener get work as soon as he appears in this country?
Yes, as the man stated here, he was a fortnight in the Shelter, and so soon as he left the Shelter he got work.

866. And in the case of a Jew being unemployed, does he get assistance from the Jewish Board of Guardians?
Yes.

867. *Chairman.*] To your knowledge are women and children ever employed in your trade?
No, I would not wish my children to learn this trade; I would not teach them it. The only thing that my wife is employed is in socking the work; to put socks into the boots. It is only the manufacturers who employ girls that sew buttons on.

868. How do you get your orders from the manufacturer; have you to go and ask for them?
We go in continually every morning; we take our work in and get it out it it is a busy time, and if it is not a busy time, it is very irregular. We may stop a whole day watching whether there is any work to give out; we are never unemployed. The manufacturer does not say, "Come in two or three days," he says, "Come in the afternoon," "Come in the morning," and that is how we are always employed.

869. Is there any favouritism in giving out work to one knifer rather than another?
In those large workshops which employ a lot of men I am of opinion that the master buys the work.

870. What do you mean by that?
He bribes; because one workman is quite as good a mechanic as another; but I am positive that a good many people have a very hard struggle to get a bit of the work from the foreman.

871. In fact there is great competition amongst the masters to get work?
Yes; some people get such quantities that one man is eating a steak while the other has not a bit of crust.

872. Earl of *Onslow.*] Does not the contractor himself give out the work?
In a good many places the master himself does it, and in a good many places the foreman.

873. There is no question of bribing where the master himself gives out the work; it is only where the foreman gives out the work, I suppose?
The foreman would not give it out without the master's permission, so far as I have a knowledge about it.

874. Then who is it that you suspect that the work is bought from?
Very likely the man gives some commission off his wages; that I could not say.

875. *Chairman.*] You said that the masters have benefited by the improvement in tools?
Yes, quite so.

876. Do you mean by that that you are better off now with that improvement in machinery than you were 20 years ago, when you were earning 25*s.* a week?
I can tell you this, that the work was much more regular the whole year through then than it is now; we can only say that we have got three months instead of through the year.

877. I asked you whether with these improved tools you can earn more money now than you could earn without these improved tools 20 years ago when you spoke of earning 25*s.* a week?
I was a sweater myself; I worked under a master when I earned 25*s.* a week.

878. You mean that you are better off now?
So far as I am only getting a straight living I am satisfied.

879. As I understand you, you admit that there are considerable evils in what is called the sweating system as applied to the boot trade?
Yes, I am very much of that opinion.

880. And you think that has been effected by improved tools?
And the greeners.

881. By great competition; and that that competition arises, to some extent, from the greeners?
Yes.

882. And you would be glad to see legislation of a kind that would do away with the sweating system, and cause the work to be done in large shops or factories?
Quite so; I am the first one for that.

883. Do you think that any legislation of that kind, by increasing the price of goods, would damage the whole trade?
No; if we all organise together, and work at raising the prices, laster and boot finisher and all, we do not want to go out on strike and do any injury to the manufacturer.

884. What I mean is, are you not afraid that anything that might make the price of these goods dearer, would affect the trade by stopping the demand for them in foreign countries?

If a

If a lot of work is made abroad, the people will find their way there as well as they find their way over here.

885. I suppose a manufacturer would be able to answer that question better than you could?
Very likely.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

SOLOMON ROSENBERG, is alled in; and having been sworn, is Examined as follows:

886. *Chairman.*] WHAT are you by trade?
A boot finisher.

887. Did you hear the evidence given before the Committee by Mr. Wildman?
I did.

888. Generally speaking, do you agree with the evidence that he gave?
I do agree with the evidence that Mr. Wildman gave, that we should work less hours.

889. What wages are you earning youself now?
The average through the year is 15 *s.* a week, and out of that I have to pay 6 *s.* 6 *d.* weekly rent, and then I have to pay 1 *s.* 3 *d.* a week for paraffin for lamp, and 1 *s.* 3 *d.* a week for coal for burning; then I have to pay 6 *d.* a week to send six children to school, at a penny a week, that comes to 9 *s.* 6 *d.* a week, and then take into consideration that I have got left 6 *s.* a week to maintain seven children, nine in family.

890. You mean that you pay what you have said, for coal and paraffin in your own lodging?
Yes; that comes to 9 *s.* 6 *d.* a week, and I have left only 6 *s.* between a family of nine to live on.

891. Have you a wife and seven children?
A wife and seven children.

892. What do you get for that rent?
Sometimes I let out a room; I have two rooms and a kitchen; sometimes if I have a tenant in, I get 2 *s.* 6 *d.* from him.

893. How many rooms are you living in now?
Now I have got three rooms. I have got the whole of the house, and cannot get any tenant in at all.

894. How many hours a day do you work?
The regular hours are from seven in the morning until 12 at night. Sometimes I have got to sit up till one o'clock in the night, and to come an hour sooner in the morning; sometimes I have to sit from six in the morning until one o'clock the next morning.

895. How many men work with you in the same place?
Now there are with me six working men and two knifers, besides my master.

896. Your master is a knifer?
Yes, but he keeps two knifers and seven working men.

897. What size room do you work in?
The room is certainly not very large and if the room were larger it would be more convenient for us.

898. You work by gaslight mostly, I suppose?
Yes.

899. Have you any complaint to make about the size of the room or the sanitary condition of the room?
What I can tell you is that we sit very close one to another; we have not much space to pass through.

900. Do you take your meals there?
Yes. When I come at six or seven in the morning, perhaps at nine or half-past nine there is breakfast, a cup of coffee and a slice of bread; and, as to dinner, I cannot take time to go to dinner; if I should go for dinner and lose an hour, or even three-quarters of an hour, I should be the loser of that. I have the dinner sent in from home, and I have the dinner at the same place where I sit and work, and by this plan my dinner takes me only about ten minutes.

901. And for breakfast you have coffee?
Coffee, which I get from the master, and bread which I take with me.

902. Bread you find yourself?
Yes.

903. And what do you have for dinner?
It is all according; sometimes coffee and bread also; and some days, if I find that I have earned a good week's wages, 24*s.* or 25*s.* in a busy week, I will have a bit of meat also; but that is only according as I can afford it.

904. What do you have for supper?
The usual supper for a finisher is a cup of tea and a slice of bread.

905. Is the tea found by the master?
We get tea at five o'clock from the master. When we go home to our own premises we have supper at home; that is only a cup of tea and a slice of bread.

906. In bad times and slack times have you to be in the shop just the same?
Yes, we have to remain in the shop whether it is busy or slack. The shortest hours we have are about 16, even in the slack time; because if our employer goes to the shop at 11 or 12 o'clock in the morning, and the manufacturer keeps him waiting there till four or five or six in the evening, we have to wait in the workshop until our master comes home, whether he has brought any work or not. Then, when he comes home, before he starts knifing, it comes to about eight or nine o'clock in the evening, and we have got to finish the work. We must finish the work so that the master may be able to take in the work the next morning; therefore we have to sit in the workshop the same hours whether we are busy or not. Sometimes for not less than 16 hours we cannot go home.

907. Have you been long in England?
Eighteen years. In 1870 I came over to England.

908. Where did you come from?
I am a Russian Pole.

909. Did you land with any money?
When I left my own country I had 300 roubles, 30 *l.*

910. How much of that had you when you arrived here?
I came to Germany; I was in Germany, in Breslau, three months; I was trying to get my living in Germany, but I could not remain in Germany because they asked me to bring papers from my own country Poland, and then I should become a German subject, but I could not get the papers from Poland because they asked me for 500 roubles, in order that they might send me over the papers, and to that amount I could not go, therefore, I was obliged to leave Germany and come to London.

911. What did you do on getting to London?
The first five months I went out pedlaring, but I could not understand the language of the country after five months, and I only had 10 *s.* left. When I

came

came over to London I had 9 *l.*, and I was here five months, and then I had left only the last 10 *s.*, and I saw it was impossible to go on pedlaring much longer, because the 10 *s.* would run away also, therefore I was obliged to learn a trade, and I became a finisher.

912. What made you take to that trade?
Because in the other trades they asked me for a premium, and I could not give it, and the finishing trade did not require a premium at all. I went for eight weeks for nothing; but my master, seeing I stuck to the work, gave me 1 *s.* 6 *d.* a week for the eight weeks; after that he gave me 8 *s.* a week, and I worked for six months for 8 *s.* a week. Then I became a piece-worker, and of course I worked at piece-work as much as I could do. I earned 20 *s.*, 22 *s.*, or 18 *s.* When I had learned the finishing I found that the trade was very greatly different from what it is at the present time; the work was paid much better then than it is now.

913. You came over to England in 1870, you say?
Yes.

914. When did the trade begin to get bad?
The last seven years we have found the trade getting worse and worse.

915. How do you account for that?
How it is I do not know; but my own idea is that there are too many of the greeners coming over to England. But the second point is that the manufacturers are taking too much advantage of the poor working men, and that that is the cause; because I remember manufacturers just starting at the same time as I did when I came over to London. They were starting manufacturing, starting with nothing, and now they are, as I should call them, very rich indeed; but I have been a working man for the same time, and I am still very poor; this is only because the manufacturers are trying to crush down the working men.

916. I suppose the manufacturers did the best they could for themselves 20 years ago, and do the best they can for themselves now; they probably made as much as they could for themselves then, and they make as much as they can for themselves now; so that that would not make any difference in the condition of the trade?
The manufacturers are rising from day to day. If a manufacturer goes at this time of year to market to sell his goods, this week he may sell them at a certain price; if he goes next week into the market and cannot sell his goods he tries to sell the goods 2½ per cent. cheaper than he did before; he sells the work cheaper; but before he can get his work done he has got three classes of working men. The first class is the upper machinist; if an upper machinist comes in to work, he says to the upper machinist, "I was obliged to sell my work cheaper; now you have got to do the work cheaper also." Of course, the upper machinist cannot help himself; he agrees; he would not go idle; he takes him off 3 *d.* from a dozen. If the manufacturer paid the upper machinist before that 4 *s.*; he offers him now 3 *s.* 9 *d.*; if the manufacturer gives out five dozen uppers to the upper machinist he takes off five threepences; that comes to 1 *s.* 3 *d.* Then the second man is the laster; if the laster comes into the shop the manufacturer tells him the same story: "I was obliged to sell the work cheaper; now you must do the work cheaper also;" then he takes off from the laster 3 *d.* a dozen also; if he gives him out five dozen pairs of boots he takes off 1 *s.* 3 *d.* from the laster also. Then the third man is the finisher; he takes off from the finisher 1 *s.* 3 *d.*; that comes to 3 *s.* 9 *d.* He sells the goods in market at 2½ per cent. reduction, and he takes profit from the working men 17¾ per cent. besides what he earns on the goods. Because he has to sell the goods 2½ per cent. cheaper he takes off through the working men about 17¾ per cent.; and this is true.

917. How are you paid; how are your wages settled?
If my master brings out work to do for 4 *s.*, of course, I get 2 *s.* the dozen, if

I do a dozen, but if he gets them out for 3*s.* 9*d*, I have to do it for half the price also, that is 1 *s.* 10½ *d.* a dozen.

918. We have heard that the price for a dozen is divided into two halves; that the master takes one half, and that the other half is divided amongst the men working for him?
That is so.

919. Is that the case in your workshop?
Yes, in our workshop it is the same.

920. But, if I understand you, there are in your workshop, besides the master, two knifers, and seven working men?
Yes.

921. That is nine men besides the master?
Nine men besides the master.

922. But do you mean that the price of the goods per dozen is divided into two halves, and that one-half goes to the master, and that the other half is divided among the nine men?
Every working man has his own work; if he does a dozen pairs of boots the master takes from me half, and half is left for himself; if I do a dozen pairs of boots one half goes for me and one half for the master; and that is the case with seven working men; but the knifers the master has to pay for; he takes one-half from the seven working men in the place where I work.

923. And you have been in this condition for how long?
For the last seven years.

924. How is it that you have never become a knifer; we have been told that men may become knifers in a year or two?
Yes, there are some of them that can become knifers in a year or two. Up till seven years ago I could get my living by going out to work also, but seven years ago I could not start being a knifer myself. I thought, if I start being a master myself, the first 12 months I do not think I should be able to go on as I ought to be, and I should be left behind entirely, and not be able to earn anything.

925. You thought you were better off as you were?
Yes.

926. Have you anything you would like to state to the Committee about the condition of the trade?
First, my opinion would be that if we working men had the same power as our manufacturers have got over us, then we could raise our wages and make them a little bit better than they are now. I will explain: Some three months ago a man named Wiles, at a boot shop in Bethnal Green, made a reduction on prices; he paid at the rate of 3*s.* 6*d.* or 4*s.*, and he wanted to take off a 6 *d.* from each dozen; the union declared a strike against this manufacturer.

927. Do you mean by that the trades union?
Yes, the working men's union; the Christian trades union declared that this shop should be on strike; that he should not have the power to bring down the wages as he intended. Then all the working men went out from this place on strike; they were out for six or seven weeks. Two or three scabs (men who take work underprice) went into this place; one day three picketers were picketing the shop from the Christian trades union, that is watching the shop, that no other men should go in and take out the work under price. A row arose between one picket and a scab, because the scab took out work, and the picket begged of him kindly that he should not be so against his own brothers and take out work at the time when his brothers had to stand out in rain and cold, and ask for more, or rather only the same wages as they had before; they told him that he ought to take the work back into the shop; but the scab was very obstinate and struggled with that picket. There was a little

a little noise between them, and the picket was locked up. At the time when the row was going on I passed that same shop, and seeing the row I stood a little away; I did not interfere at all with it. I saw that the manufacturer came out of the shop and struck with his umbrella over the head the second picket (there were three pickets), and he cleft his head open entirely. The second picket was taken into hospital, and lay in the hospital eight days; the first picket that had the row with that scab was locked up, and when they came before the magistrate, the magistrate said it is very wrong that a man should go and injure other men at a time when they were asking for and struggling for bread; that the man was not authorised to go in and scab the shop; but he said, "I will make the picket pay a fine of 10 *s.*;" he paid it. Then, when the second picket came out from the hospital, the man whose head had been cleft open by the manufacturer, he summoned the manufacturer for striking him. When it came on for trial the case was dismissed. This is surely a proof that the manufacturer has more rights to do what he likes with the working men than we working men can do with the manufacturer. If a working man asks for more wages, and if anything happens in our sight, we get the blame and suffer for it; the manufacturer does not take any interest, whether he is right or wrong, but he has the full power. I saw myself this case.

928. Do you belong to a union?
To the Jewish Journeymen Boot Finishers' Society.

929. Are you an official of the union?
I was secretary for the first 12 months, but now I am only an ordinary member.

930. What object has that association?
We have established the society because we were always called by the English working men scabs; they always used to say that we Jews were scabbing every shop; whatever wages the shop paid we were scabbing them; that we were doing away with the prices. Therefore 40 of us working men in number said, "Let us form a union and show the English working men that we are not against them, but are willing to work as brothers with them."

931. You have not had very much success with it, have you?
No, not at present.

932. What is the reason of that?
Because our society is not strong enough yet for us to be able to ask for more wages; and even if we should ask, if we should try for something more, our society is not strong.

933. Why is it not stronger; why do not more men join it?
Now we number 200 members; but those 200 are all working men; they have been six, seven, 10, and 18 years in London; but there are a number of boot finishers in existence now, 5,000 or 6,000, and those are only greeners; they have been here only six or seven months; they do not know whether work in London was better some years ago; they do not know whether work in London is worse now; as they come over from foreign parts they think that London was always in the same circumstances as it is at the present time. Therefore those greeners do not belong to the society; they say that they can do without the society. If they can earn 3*s.* or 2*s.* 6*d.* a day they are satisfied; but they do not consider that if they keep on working the same number of years that I have been in the trade, that is 18 years, they will not be able to work those hours; but it is impossible to get them to understand it.

934. Do you mean that they are satisfied because they find themselves better off here than they were at home, or do you mean that they are satisfied because they do not think that anything could be done to make them better off here?
They are satisfied, because in their own country they did not have so much freedom from the Russian Czar. I should say that at the present time Russia is not what I should call a civilised country.

 935. When

935. When you speak of these 5,000 or 6,000 "greeners" being satisfied, do you mean that they are content?

Yes, it must be so, or else they would become members of the society, in order that the society should be able to do something for them.

936. Do you think that your society cannot have much effect in raising wages as long as there are these 5,000 or 6,000 greeners who stand outside it?

We could exist even with the small number which we have at present if we could get a little privilege from you that we should be able to ask for more wages.

937. Have the members of your society ever struck for higher wages; have they ever tried to get higher wages?

They only say that the price is bad, but they have never tried.

938. They have never gone out on strike?

No; they have never tried to get better wages.

939. Why not?

Because they are afraid of the manufacturer, and afraid of the police also, as I can say; because, whilst that shop that I spoke of just now was on strike that same manufacturer posted bills on the dead walls stating that working men earning 7 *s.* a day were going out on strike, and that at a time of slack work it was surely unreasonable that working men earning 7 *s.* a day should go out on strike; but he tried to send in to the workhouses also letters saying that if poor people like those from the boot-finishing class came for assistance to the workhouses they should not give it to them, because they earned 7 *s.* a day and went out on strike. One day a gentleman, I do not know who it was, it was not the inspector, came round to these pickets at the shop, and asked that they should show their books for him to see what they had earned during the time that they had been in work. One showed a book with 5 *s.* a week; one showed a book with 10 *s.* a week, with the manufacturer's handwriting; one showed a book with 4 *s.* 9 *d.* That gentleman went into the manufacturer, and said to him, "How can you send letters that the working men were earning so much wages, as I have seen the books myself, and they only earn 4 *s.* 6 *d.*, 5 *s.*, and 7 *s.* a week." He took off the posted bills, but he did not tell the working men that he would raise the wages or not take off anything from the wages. Nobody interests themselves unless, if we have got power to try for it, and it is only in our power that we should be able to try anything.

940. You do not consider that you are strong enough?

No; but we made a proposition last Saturday night in our meeting, and it would be, perhaps, very much in favour of us working men, that the greeners should be kept away from London or from the trade entirely. I am very sorry (because I am a foreigner also) that I should speak against my own brothers; but as we can see that they do not interest themselves whether the trade shall rise or fall down and go lower, but so long as they are here in this country and can earn a shilling they are satisfied, we think that the country should not be spoiled over them so much. If formerly people used to make a living, and comfortably (because if the working man earned 25 *s.* or 26 *s.* a week he was very satisfied), that they should bring down the trade so much that the workman should earn only 15 *s.* or 16 *s.* a week and not make a living for a wife and family, is very bad. But the manufacturer takes the most advantage against the old working men because of the greeners, the new beginners. If an old working man comes into a shop and refuses the work on reduction of wages, he says, "If you will not do the work I can get plenty who will do it." The work that the greeners do is sellable enough; they can sell it; whether a greener does the work or a man who has been in the trade for 10 years, the work is sold the same, because whoever buys a pair of boots does not look whether the boots are finished properly or not; he is asked for the price and pays it, therefore, the manufacturers are satisfied that the greener should come over; the greeners make their fortune; but for us working men who have suffered in this country for

for so many years it is very bad; we have no more strength to work those hours that we have worked up till now.

941. Is the work that is done by the greener really as good as the work as is done by the old finisher; I mean are the boots as good?
Yes, the boot is good enough. If a greener who has been four weeks in the trade should go in and do the class of work which the manufacturer paid 4 *d.* a pair, if he should go in and do the same for 2½ *d.* a pair, he will be satisfied; he will take him on and he will give him out all the work, and he will sell the work; he will not keep the work for himself, he will sell it, and sell it at the same price as what he would pay 4 *d.* for finishing.

942. You mean that the work is as good in quality?
Even in finishing, they are as good finished through the greener as they are from the old finisher; so long as the manufacturer can get it cheaper he is satisfied; he does not look whether they are good finished or not good finished.

943. You say now that the manufacturer does not look to see whether they are good finished or not good finished; what I asked you was, whether they are as good finished when they are done by these greeners at a cheap rate as they were when done by a workman who had been a long time in the trade?
It would be a little different; of course what a good tradesman can do, a new beginner cannot do; but they are good enough for a manufacturer to sell. Of course by an old working man they would be finished better.

944. Have you worked in many workshops?
When I came over I worked for one master for the period of nine years.

945. Could you describe that workshop to the Committee at all, how many men worked in it, and the size of it?
This workshop was a very small one; we sat at the same time six of us, but it was not large enough for four.

946. How was it warmed?
Too much, because we worked by gas by day and by night; by day we required gas to warm the irons; by night we required gas that there should be light in the workshop. In some workshops you will find by night some six or seven lights, and the rooms are very small.

947. And had you any fire at all?
No. There are some masters who do not work by gas by day; some only work by fire; they do not heat the irons I mean by gas, but only by fire; and at night-time they must have fire to heat the iron, and gas as well for light.

948. And the room is very small and very hot?
Yes.

949. And is any air let into the room?
No, surely not; if he feels very hot, of course he opens the window; and if a workman sits and works hard, so that he sweats, and he opens the window, it is very easy to catch a cold, and we must shut the window again.

950. You have worked 16 hours daily, you say?
Sixteen hours is nothing to mention; 18, 19, and 20 hours; 16 we have worked in slack times. When we earn 8 *s.* or 9 *s.* a week we have got to work 16 hours for that.

951. You worked for nine years in one shop?
Yes.

952. And have you been in many shops since?
During my 18 years I have seen many workshops.

953. Is there much difference; are some better and some worse?
Some of them look a little different, but very little different.

 954. Have

954. Have any of the workshops that you have been in been inspected by the sanitary inspector?
No; the inspectors do not take any interest at all.

955. Did anybody sleep in the rooms you have worked in?
Some of them; some workshops are to be found which are sleeping rooms also.

956. Earl of *Onslow.*] Do you think that if the whole of the members of your society were to go on strike it would cause any great inconvenience to the contractors?
It would not be much; they would get in greeners at once. We would not be able to stay out at the present time, not for a week to keep away the greeners.

957. You said that you object to your fellow-countrymen coming over to this country; a good many of them come over because they suffer so much from persecution, do they not?
That is true enough; some of them come over who suffer from persecution in their own country.

958. Is there anywhere else where they could find work of any kind, and not be persecuted?
I do not know; the world is large enough. I should say that London is over-populated.

959. Have they ever given you any reason why they preferred London to any other place?
They say that London does not cost too much to come over, because this is the nearest place to come over to with the smallest amount; therefore they come here.

960. Why do they not go to other continental capitals, such as Paris, Berlin, and Vienna?
I cannot answer you why they do not go.

961. You said that the business was divided into three heads, I think; the upper machinist, the laster, and the finisher?
Yes.

962. Would you not be able to command a better price if you could in the same workroom do all three things?
It requires three different workmen.

963. But could you not have those three different workmen in the same room?
No, I do not think we could. If the manufacturer liked, the manufacturer could have them in and have the work finished on his own premises, have the work lasted on his own premises, and have the work machined on his own premises; if he liked he could have them. There are some upper machinists who do the work indoors by the manufacturer; there are some lasters who do the work by the manufacturer, but not the finishing.

964. And do you think that boots could be produced under those circumstances as cheaply as they are now?
If we could have a chance to earn 5*s.* or 6*s.* a week more, the consumer would have to pay 6*d.* more for a pair of boots.

965. Lord *Clinton.*] Is a boot finished by a greener as good as one finished by an experienced manufacturer?
It may be, but they are not so good; but they are doing it cheaply, and they are good enough for sale.

966. But do you think that anybody who bought them would find that they were not so good?
No.

967. They

967. They are as good, you think, for the person who buys them?
Yes. There are some classes of work called washed in bottoms; the manufacturer wants that the bottoms should be so clean that if there is any mark, the simplest mark on them, he tells them to take home, but if a customer goes and buys a pair of boots, then at the first moment he tries them on, if they fit him, the sole gets spoilt at once, therefore we can see that the customer does not look at whether they are better finished.

968. Earl of *Limerick.*] If I understand your evidence, it is not worth the while of the skilled workman to make better boots than the greener makes; he gets paid no better; they are all paid at the same rate; I do not mean the different classes, but the skilled workman would get no better pay for the same sort of boots than the greener would?
Yes.

969. And therefore the work done is no better than the work that a greener would do?
No; the greener does the work not quite so well as an old workman, that is an impossibility of course; if an old workman does the pair of boots, or a new beginner does it, they are different, but if the manufacturer had to pay the greener the same wages as an old working man then he would rather have the old working man, but as he can get the work done by the greener cheaper, therefore he gives the work out to the greener, and he can sell the work.

970. The boots are good enough for the manufacturer's purpose in fact?
Yes, they are good enough.

971. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] You said that in your shop the master kept two knifers and seven finishers?
Yes.

972. Then does the master work himself?
Yes.

973. He works as a knifer?
Yes, because the two knifers cannot keep the rest on.

974. In that slack time you spoke of, when you are obliged to be in the shop when there is nothing going on, do you sit idle; have you nothing to do at all?
No.

975. You sit quite quiet?
Yes.

976. Waiting?
Waiting until our employer will come home.

977. For many hours together?
Sometimes we have got to wait three hours or four hours; then if we see that the master does not come home so quick we go to the shops to see where he is: but if the manufacturer liked he could give out the work to the master at the first moment he comes in, and asks for the work.

978. Why do the manufacturers not do that; would it not pay them better to give out the work at once?
This is to their benefit; if a manufacturer gets in an order say at the beginning of the week, and the order has to be finished by the end of the week, he keeps back the work from the working man, not giving it out to the master, Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday either.

979. Why?
He shows in that way to the working man, the master, that he is slack; he has not got any work.

980. That is what he says, you mean?
Yes.

981. But why does he do so; what good does he get by that?
He had a good reason. When it comes to Wednesday, if the master comes in again, he says, "I have no work for you, but I will make up a stock; if you are unwilling to do it under price, I cannot give you any work at all." What can a finisher do? He is obliged to take it at 6 *d.* less. Then he gives him out five or six dozen and tells him to bring it in the next morning; so long as he agrees for a sixpence a dozen less he gives him out so many dozens and says, "Bring them in the next morning." He first purposely tries to show the working men that he has not work, and then late in the week he gives the work out and wants it brought in at once.

982. At a lower price; he has to pay less?
Yes, he pays less for it.

983. Lord *Sandhurst.*] You have always been a workman, have you not, not an employer?
No, never an employer.

984. Do you agree with what was said by another witness, that you would never be an employer of greeners?
Yes. At the present time, if you will come into any workshop to a master you will find a greener, no doubt.

985. But you say that the manufacturers buy the work that is done by greener masters and greener men?
Yes.

986. Then why would it not pay to employ greeners; why would you not employ greeners?
Because the greeners have spoilt the trade by their doing the work under price. If the greener goes into a shop, and the manufacturer offers him 2*s.* 6*d.* a dozen for what he has been paying 4*s.* for, he takes it. If he says "I will pay 3*s.*" for what he paid 4*s.* for, he will take it and not make any remark. Also the master can scab the shop by employing greeners. If the working men were on strike because of a reduction of wages and would not agree to it, the master would ask the manufacturer for the same price as he had before, or he would ask for something extra. If a master goes to the manufacturer and takes out work at a time when the shop is at feud with the men, the master cannot get all the working men to do the work, but he gets only greeners: he takes them in wherever he can get them, and he gets the work done by them, and the master says, "In two or three days I can make a finisher just the same as the old working man."

987. Should you like to see this registration of workshops?
That would be necessary also. Perhaps it would be better to have this registered workshop. But my opinion is, that if we were able to work indoors by the manufacturer altogether, that the manufacturer should make the workshop and take in lasters and sewing machines, and finishers and knifers and everything, and that the work should be done on his premises, then it would be much better for the trade.

988. *Chairman.*] Do you think that would not increase the cost of making the goods?
If the manufacturer had all the work done in his factory, his lasting, finishing, and machining, we would make a society between us inside by the manufacturer that no deduction should be made any more. Therefore if he would ask for more wages all of us would agree to it, because we would be inside altogether; but one is in one corner and the other in another, and we cannot work together, and we have not the power to ask for it.

989. What I want to know is whether a dozen boots would cost more if they were made entirely in a factery than they do now when they are taken out of a factory and finished outside, wages remaining the same?
They would come to the same price.

990. Lord

990. Lord *Sandhurst.*] I should like to ask you this, as you were secretary of a trade's union, would you like to see any restriction upon the number of hours, shorter hours?
Yes.

991. But that would materially reduce the wages that you could earn?
At present we could not, but we would be compelled, all of us, then, to ask the manufacturer for more wages, because a greener would not be able to come in a factory to work. Then the manufacturer would not have the same power to say, "If you will not do the work for the same price, I will get a greener who will do the work for me." If he worked shorter hours, of course, at the present moment, it would be smaller wages for the working man; but we could raise the wages afterwards if we had not this greener behind us, and we would work shorter hours; every one that belongs to this trade would be compelled after to be united, and to ask for some more.

992. When did you give up being secretary to this trade's union?
About 16 weeks ago.

993. Did you have many good workmen amongst the unemployed, or could they always get employment?
You will find plenty of thoroughly good working men without work, and if they come in to a master to ask for work they surely find two or three greeners sitting at work. There is not one workshop in the East-end of London where you will not have two or three greeners.

994. That is, the greeners work to the exclusion of the good workmen?
Yes.

995. *Chairman.*] Do you know at all what grindery costs the master?
It is all according as the masters state it. I have nothing to do with the masters, but, as the masters state it, a dozen pairs of boots costs them 6 *d.* grindery; it may be that it is so, it may be it is not.

996. You do not know?
That is quite out of my knowledge; I do not interfere in that.

997. I suppose you have known a great many greeners since you have been in London?
Too many.

998. Are they disappointed when they come over here; do they expect to find better wages and better work?
No, they do not care whether they have better work; they are satisfied when they come if they can learn the trade; we never hear them saying that the hours are too long, or the work paid too low, they are always satisfied, because they have got more strength than we have; for the working man who has only just come over is a little stronger than a workman who has been working 18 or 20 hours a day; he does not feel so much whether it is hard work or not.

999. You never hear men complain that if they had known what was going to happen to them when they came here they would not have come here?
A great many of them, if they had known the suffering that was going to happen would not have come. When they come over they do not know it, but when they have been here seven or eight years they would be more satisfied if they had remained in their own country.

1000. Do you think they are ever persuaded to come here by false accounts of the wages they can earn?
It is all according. Some of them come over because they do not care to stay in the Russian army. I can say for myself, that if I had received my rights in my native country where I was born, surely I would not have come to London; but I only got away because of not having rights; because the Czar of Russia, as I have said before, wants more civilisation than he has at the present time; because, if it comes to rates or taxes, or duties, a Jew and a Gentile have got to pay the same; there is no distinction then between

a Jew and a Gentile, they are brothers; but if a Jew should wish to live in a different place from where he lives, he is reckoned by the Russian Czar then as a Jew; a Jew must not have the power to live where he likes; if a Jew goes as a soldier, and improves as a soldier, so that he ought not to be like an ordinary soldier, but to rise, the Russian Czar makes the remark, "you are a Jew, you ought not rise." For everything else, Jew and Gentile are reckoned as brothers; but if it should come to wanting to be a little higher, he is reckoned a Jew; therefore I thought myself if I were to go into the Russian Army for 15 years, and afterwards be driven from one place to another, maybe if I was a soldier, if there should be a war, I will fight against the enemy the same as the Christian; may be I shall fall in the battle, but if I should prove that I ought to rise higher than an ordinary soldier, I am a Jew, I cannot have that; therefore I left Russia and came to England, because here Jews and Gentiles have no distinction made, they can live as brothers together.

1001. You have been 20 years in London?
Eighteen years.

1002. Do you consider yourself to be a fair average specimen of the circumstances and condition of a man in the same trade?
Yes.

1003. I suppose there are some better off, and some worse off?
It is all according; a working man who can work quick, earns 2 *d.* or 3 *d.* a day more; that comes to 1 *s.* a week.

1004. Are you a quick working man?
I am a quick working man.

1005. Then probably there are a good many worse off than you?
If it will not be against the rule for me to do so, I will produce to you a letter which I was obliged to send to the Jewish Board of Guardians' committee about three weeks ago, after I have been suffering in this country 18 years. I am working very hard, and a quick workman, and I was obliged to send this letter the day before our holiday; but, to my misfortune, the place was shut. This is after working 18 years in the country: "24, St. George's-terrace, Commercial-road, E.C., London, 25th March 1888. Gentlemen, I hope you will excuse me for coming before you with my writing. You may really believe if I had any other advice to assist me I should not apply to you with this application. Although I am 18 years in London I can assure you that this is my first application to you on a day before Youm Tour, and you can certainly ascertain this with your books. I have no employment, and I have no advice to prepare for the holidays. You may surely believe, although I am a working man, as a word of honour, that I am very much in need of any assistance whatever. I am really deprived of all the necessities of life, with my seven children. The question may appear to you, if I am so destitute, why did I delay of appealing to the committee of relief before. Then, in reply, I have been to the committee about four months ago, and you granted me a sovereign, and Mr. Stephany gave me a coal ticket. I promised to repay it; but as the time is so bad I could not repay it all; I hope, if employment improves, I shall act according to my promise; therefore I could not take the liberty to apply to you once more. I pray to you, gentlemen, kindly to deliberate the matter, and to assist me in any way possible. I shall be a thousand times thankful to you. I remain, Gentlemen, Yours humbly, *Solomon Rosenberg*. Board of Guardians, 13, Devonshire-square, E.C.

1006. That describes your condition now after working 18 years?
Yes, I am called a good working man and a quick working man, and between 50 working men I can earn the most wages, and I am in the state there described; and now you can imagine how a working man, who cannot work so much as I do, is situated.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

17*th April* 1888.

SOLOMON BAUM, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined as follows:

1007. *Chairman.*] WHAT is your business?
A boot-laster.

1008. Have you listened to the evidence that has just been given to the Committee?
Yes.

1009. And do you generally agree in what was said by the witness?
To a certain extent.

1010. Perhaps you will explain to the Committee in what way you differ?
My belief is, that if we were to shorten the hours in the workshop it would make a great improvement, but I am very much afraid for the Free Trade; that it will injure us in that respect, because I do believe that large contractors could not execute their orders, and therefore we should get foreign labour, and that would be worse still for us here.

1011. Earl of *Onslow.*] You mean that the trade would go abroad instead of being in this country?
Yes.

1012. *Chairman.*] Do you employ any men?
As a rule some of the lasters do employ a lot of boys.

1013. Do you employ any?
I employ one man, and have done for five years, and a boy to send to shop with the work.

1014. We have had no evidence from any laster at present; perhaps you will explain to the Committee what the business consists of?
Yes, I can explain. As the last witness spoke about organising a Trade Union, if this Trade Union had not been in existence (as I said to a manufacturer a few weeks ago), I believe we should be crushed still more than we are at the present time; and I do not think there are any witnesses who will come here, who will tell you how they are crushed by the employers. It is not the masters but the employers that are the cause of it. If the working men had an organisation amongst themselves, and if the work came from the manufacturer day after day with a reduction of wages, and the working men said, "No, we will not take it;" the master would have to take the basket of work back to the shop, and it could not be done. Only last week I went to one of the shopmates who has been working with me in one shop. This shows what advantage the master takes of us. Before Christmas, I went to work for a particular friend of mine. Just before Christmas, two of them together, one in the Mile End-road and one in the New-road, took off cardboard. As a rule they are giving cardboard out, and they give a sheet and a half of cardboard to each dozen pair of boots. That sheet and a half, I believe, according to the manufacturer buying it wholesale, will cost him a penny, and before Christmas they tried to take this cardboard off. So one manufacturer did not give cardboard for that week, and I was short, and there were 18 pair of composition clumps, and they wanted me to pay 1 *s.* 6 *d.* for them, and through a hard struggle I got off luckily with 1 *s.* So on the Friday when I went in for my wages, I asked him for the cardboard money; he said, "We do not allow any cardboard money." I had spoken to an English shopmate before I went in, and said to him, "Do you receive cardboard?" he said, "I did not receive any this week, but I shall speak for it;" and I said, "If you will speak for it I will," and he laughed at me. I had to give 1 *s.* 10½ *d.* for cardboard, and with a hard struggle I had 1 *s.* Another manufacturer I worked for took off the cardboard altogether, and paid 1 *s.* a dozen instead of a sheet and a half. But what you make over two gross, which comes to more than 2 *s.* for cardboard on the two gross of boots, they do not acknowledge;

over two gross they did not acknowledge it. I spoke for it, and could not get it. This is what we call a material for the goods that we are getting out, and this sheet and a half is not sufficient; we have to buy more cardboard, and the paper insole and paper stiffeners are horrible. And at the same time, in regard to this manufacturer, as the last witness, Rosenberg, said, they struck against the shop of Mr. Wiles. I worked for the shop that I mentioned just now. I had the sack because I belonged to the Trade Union; that was two weeks before this holiday. Without any consideration I had the sack, and I asked the reason. At first the foreman would not tell the reason, but when I told him I was sorry that I had not taken this boot and showed it before the Trades Union, he told me, "That is the reason that you have got the sack." That was a boot that other shops were paying 6*s.* 6*d.* for; the same boot. I should say 5*s.* 6*d.*, at the least, other shops paid. I received in this shop 2*s.* 9*d.*; he offered that to me, and I went in and told him, "I cannot make this boot for 2*s.* 9*d.* How can you expect me to make for 2*s.* 9*d.* a dozen pair of boots?" I asked him for 3*d.* more, and the governor came in and asked me what I was grumbling for. I said, "You know very well that for the same boot I have had as much as 6½*d.*; but I shall be satisfied if instead I can get 3 *s.* 6 *d.* a dozen; but at 2*s.* 9*d.* I could not get a living." The consequence was he gave me 3*d.* more on this work, and when I finished off the three dozen he sacked me. Our secretary went there, Mr. Solomon, who gave evidence here, and he asked him why he sacked me. He told him because I always did grumble. I should like to ask any shopmate, or anybody, if a man has not got a right to grumble when a man has to work 16 or 18 hours a day, and Sunday morning there was not any breakfast in his house. I will prove it by his book.

1015. How many hours do you work?
Now I work 15 or 16 hours.

1016. Do you work in your own room?
Yes.

1017. You employ one man?
One man and my own boy; I took him to the bench only two weeks ago.

1018. In what condition are the boots when they come to you?
It is not a boot; it is an upper. I had in my mind to bring a pair to show how it is done; single handed, a single man can do a dozen a day.

1019. And the man whom you employ, does he do just the same work as you do?
No, he cannot do the same work that I do; a laster is more like a mechanic.

1020. What is the man doing?
He puts the heels on, puts the sole on; I last the upper, and the man puts on the stuff.

1021. You are paid for doing that so much a dozen?
Yes.

1022. How do you pay the man who works for you?
Our men get paid weekly, mostly; but if they are piece-workers the master takes them off 1 *s.* a dozen, 6 *d.* for grindery and 6 *d.* for going to the shop.

1023. How do you pay the man who works for you?
The man who works for me at the present time gets 18*s.* a week; five years ago I used to pay him a guinea a week.

1024. You pay him at the rate of 18 *s.* a week?
At the present time.

1025. Do you mean independently of the amount of work you have to do; when you have no work do you pay him 18 *s.*?
No.

1026. Only when you have got work?
Yes.

1027. How

1027. How much do you make yourself?
That man works with me; we work together; I do not make them right out myself; I should not get a living if I worked single handed.

1028. I asked you how much money you made yourself?
I can earn as much as 2 *l.* a week when I am busy.

1029. What do you earn all the year round?
I never took any average; but during the year for the last three years I did not earn as much as 7 *s.* or 5 *s.* a week.

1030. Do you mean that you have not earned 5 *s.* a week?
Not for three years not up to last Christmas, not out of my own earnings.

1031. What do you pay for your lodgings?
I pay 8 *s.* 6 *d.* per week.

1032. How do you live if you have had to pay 8 *s.* 6 *d.* and only receive 5 *s.*
I had a great deal of help amongst my friends that I have got here in England; they help me a great deal.

1033. Lord *Thring.*] I understand your complaint about the cardboard to be, that the manufacturer usually supplies you with cardboard, and that that particular man did not?
I have explained that in the period before Christmas while the trade is so slack, they try to rob you a penny a dozen pair of boots, of this bit of cardboard that costs them a penny a dozen.

1034. *Chairman.*] I also understand that you say, that you are so weak that you cannot help yourself in this state of things, the manufacturers are so much stronger than you are that they are able to cut you down even to the extent of stopping this small supply of cardboard?
Yes.

1035. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] With regard to the man who works under you, is he always in the shop whether you have got work or not?
It is not necessary, because up to last year I was more independent of shops than I have been for the last nine months since I started working a little, because I never work for those shops in the East-end, because it is true that they pay as much less in a dozen pair of boots as the price is 4 *s.* 6 *d.*, providing lasting, finishing, and machining, than they are paying at Bethnal Green and Hackney-road.

1036. Then before this year you used to get work pretty regularly?
Yes. If there was not work in the shop where I was working they told me "There is no work to-day." The foreman used to say to me "Do not come in the afternoon."

1037. *Chairman.*] Do I understand that you work for the shops in the West-end of London?
At Hackney-road.

1038. Lord *Thring.*] Do I understand that the system of working in Hackney-road is different from the system of working in the East-end of London?
A great deal; and the reason I can explain, because there are more English workers in Hackney-road than there are in the East-end, and therefore these "greeners" have not got the cheek to go up and work amongst them; there are more English people working there.

1039. You are talking of English workmen in Hackney-road, not of foreign workmen?
No, English workmen.

1040. Then there is no sweating in Hackney-road?
As for sweating, I can answer that the sweating system goes on in our trade even in the country amongst the English workpeople; around Northampton, and

and around Leicester, there is work sent to the small villages by the manufacturers, who get it done amongst the women.

1041. Do I understand you to say that the Hackney-road system is better than the East-end system?
Yes, a great deal better than it is in the East-end.

1042. The sweating is not so severe there?
No.

1043. *Chairman.*] Because of the absence of these greeners?
Yes.

1044. Earl of *Limerick.*] I think you said that it was 4*s.* 6*d.* a dozen better in the Hackney-road?
Yes, I reckoned the average; the laster, the finisher, and the machinist.

1045. And do you think that it is because the foreign greeners do not go to that part so much?
Quite so.

1046. Lord *Clinton.*] Do women work in your trade in London?
No, not at lasting.

1047. They do in the country?
To a certain extent; they help in the pasting.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. WILLIAM HOFFMAN, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

1048. *Chairman.*] WHAT is your employment?
I am now a journalist, and have been so since the beginning of this year; before that, I was a foreman in the Bective Boot Factory.

1049. What paper are you employed on?
The "Shoe and Leather Record." I have been in the boot trade 26 years.

1050. By reason of the knowledge you acquired in the boot trade, I suppose you are pretty well acquainted with the sweating system as applied to that trade?
I am well acquainted with the sweating system in the boot trade, and have written about it before; some four or five years ago.

1051. And since then in your journalistic capacity; have you been specially investigating the subject?
Yes.

1052. Can you give the Committee any information as to the sanitary condition of the workrooms where the work is generally carried on?
I have visited many of these rooms at all hours of the night, and almost invariably they are in a very dirty condition. So far as space is concerned many of them would be considered sufficiently airy; small undoubtedly; very much too small for the number of persons employed therein. The atmosphere is stuffy and stifling, at all events to men not used to it, and must be very weakening to the men employed therein. And also speaking of the houses generally, so far as I have noticed backyards, and so on, and accumulations of dust and dirt, cleanliness seems to be one of the things very much unknown in the sweating colonies.

1053. Where are they generally situated?
Generally in Spitalfields, Whitechapel, and over towards the Commercial-road.

1054. Is

1054. Is the work generally carried on in rooms that people sleep in?

Yes, very largely. I should say from my experience that nearly one-half of the sweaters' workshops, I may perhaps be exaggerating, I will not say one-half, but a very large number, have beds in the rooms where sometimes some of the workmen sleep, and at other times even the families. I may here give you an outline of one, for instance, in which we were a few days ago. It was a double room, none too large, in which there were at work 10 men. I may say that the men were not all at work at the time, but I have since ascertained that 10 men are usually employed there. In that same room, in another part of it, is the bed in which the family sleeps. Here there were six children, the husband and the wife; so that at night time there would be 18 souls in that one room.

1055. Have you got the size of the room?

I did not take the size of the room, but it would be the ordinary average smallish room that you would find in the dwellings of the East-end, two rooms with the partition removed.

1056. Can you give me an idea of the size of the room?

I am afraid I could not venture.

1057. "The ordinary size of a small private room" is rather vague?

I should say that it would be, perhaps, nine feet one way, and perhaps 15 feet another.

1058. And in that room you say there were 18 people?

Ten workmen, and the family sleep in the same room; I have also seen beds in cellars and underground places; I have seen the workmen sit at their benches, and when they ceased work they would simply lay their clothes down upon the benches and get into the bed in the corner.

1059. And as to the lighting and air?

The light in upstair rooms generally is good; in downstair rooms, in cellars and underground kitchens, very often they have to work by lamplight or gaslight all day; I have met with one or two instances of that kind.

1060. Are there any women and children employed in the trade?

Amongst the Jews, women are almost only employed by the master sweaters for the purpose of socking work; these women, as a rule, have to work, some one, two, or three hours after the men have left off work, so as to brush and sock and tie the work ready for shop the next day; that is the women's work. With regard to children, I have not found many at work, though I have found several at work at 12 and 1 o'clock in the morning at boot finishing, exactly as men would be.

1061. You do not mean that these women work as long as the men, and three hours longer?

No, I mean that they have to take up the work when it comes from the finishers, their husbands and the men, and then put the finishing touch to it, so to speak, the socking, buttoning, tying, and so on. Infant or child labour and female labour is more prevalent amongst English finishers than it is amongst Jews. It is very often the case amongst English finishers, who are not spoken of as sweaters, that families are employed by them.

1062. How are the general sanitary conveniences and the provisions for decency?

I cannot say that I have made that a special feature in my investigations. I wanted more particularly to see the aspect of the question as it affected the boot trade, so that I did not make many, or indeed any, inquiries as to the sanitary arrangements of the houses generally. As I said before, the impression that I gained from the houses that I have gone into is, that the houses are, many of them, in a most dilapidated condition; in many instances I should think very unhealthy; and rents exceedingly high.

1063. You have, of course, as you told us, an acquaintance with the whole circumstances of the boot trade?

Yes.

1064. Perhaps you would give the Committee your views as to the present condition of the trade generally; and before you do so, there is one point I should like to have cleared up, if we can, and that is this: We have had it in evidence that in slack times orders are given out by the manufacturer very irregularly very near the close of the week; and we have had evidence that they do it on purpose in order to give the idea that they have not got much work to give out, and in order to keep prices down; I should like to know whether, in your experience, that is the case or not?

I have no positive knowledge, but certainly the characteristics of some of the manufacturers employing sweaters would warrant one almost in drawing such conclusions.

1065. Is it the fact that the orders are given out in this irregular way?

Undoubtedly.

1066. Can you account for it in any other way?

There may be another way of accounting for it, and that is that work being slack there is not sufficient work to do, and as the small orders come in so they give them out. I may say that the boot trade is very irregular now to what it used to be years ago. For three or four months in the year it will be very busy, and at other parts of the year it will be very slack. I may say that that is true of the boot trade from one end of it to the other now-a-days, from the very commonest to the very best work; in fact, I may say that the very best skilled workmen of London have scarcely on an average now nine months' full work in the year. What I mean is, that if the short hours that they have to work in some parts of the year, and the hours that they have to lose, were all totalled together, one may say that they are only in work nine or ten months in the year; nine perhaps is a large average, and the other three months they may be said to be standing absolutely idle.

1067. What has caused that change in the condition of the trade?

There are undoubtedly very many causes; it would be hard to say that any one thing is the cause of it; but so far undoubtedly this is one cause: there are a good many boot manufacturers now (too many boot manufacturers), more than there used to be. Or again, another explanation is this, that the self-same number of men will probably make now twice the quantity of boots that they used to do some few years ago. That is due undoubtedly to the improvement of machinery and more minute sub-division of labour.

1068. In other words supply has run ahead of the demand?

Well, hardly so; hardly run ahead of demand if we mean by the demand the necessities of men.

1069. I mean by demand the people who want to buy boots?

Yes, that is the usual way of putting it; I would rather say the ability of men to buy boots.

1070. Earl of *Onslow.*] Do you mean that the purchasing power of the community has diminished?

Undoubtedly, that is my opinion.

1071. Both at home and abroad?

As regards our colonial trade the falling off in that direction is probably due to two causes. One is, as Mr. Arnold White has already mentioned, that the colonial markets have been flooded with shoddy goods. That is true of the boot trade as of many other trades, and therefore the colonists have turned themselves round, and are using their own raw materials, and are producing boots for themselves. So far as my information goes, the boots they produce in the colonies are not so stylish and well made, but, at all events, they are all leather, instead of being three parts paper, as a great deal of the English work sent to them is.

1072. And

1072. And does that apply in any degree to the foreign trade, the Continental trade?

I do not think that the Continental trade has to any very large extent influenced the class of goods which are produced by the sweating system. The goods which are sent from the Continent, from Switzerland, from Austria, and so on, are usually boots of a superior kind, that is, fine ladies' glacé boots. These boots cannot be produced at the same prices here, but these are boots which are scarcely ever attempted to be made by manufacturers employing sweating labour; so that the sweating labour is not in any sense caused by the exports or imports from the Continent; indeed, I would say that I do not believe there is a spot on earth where boots can be made cheaper than they can be in London under the sweating system.

1073. *Chairman.*] What I understood you to say was that now, by improved tools, and so on, the same number of men make a much larger quantity of boots than they could formerly?

Yes.

1074. And that that accounted for the irregularity of these orders, and for the fact that even the most skilled workman can only work nine months in the year; that is what I meant by saying that the supply has outrun the demand; the supply has largely increased owing to the improvement of machinery?

Yes, and subdivision of labour, and similar things, I may say. Of course we know that, with regard to pretty well all goods nowadays, the turn-over of business men, in all trades, is at a very much lower percentage than it used to be; and whenever employers take an order they will take it at a lower profit, but will turn it over very much quicker than they used to do. Hence manufacturers nowadays, whether in the best or the common trade, as soon as they get an order, put on all the hands they can get, working overtime, to get the order out of hand, with the hope of being able to get another when that is completed; so that the hours of labour all round are exceedingly irregular for that reason. Indeed, it seems to me that the whole process of manufacturing, and the men engaged therein, are regarded as a kind of machinery for doing a certain work, and when that is done the machine must stand still. As regards suggestions in reference to the abolition or amending of the sweating system, many suggestions could be made; but I suppose all that you require are those which are immediately practicable. I would seriously recommend what Mr. White has already said; that is, the registration of all workrooms which at the present time are being used as workshops. I think that they should be subject to the visitation of an inspector at any time and at any hour.

1075. Do you mean an inspector under the Factory Acts?

Yes; and I would suggest that, instead of inspectors, as now, going to all kinds of trades, going to a tailor's shop first, and to a boot shop next, different inspectors, having a technical knowledge of the trades, should be appointed inspectors of the shops of those particular trades. Your Lordships know that workmen have a great respect always for a man that understands their trade, but always feel some contempt, however nicely or kindly he may speak to them, if he is a "greener," and does not understand the technicalities of their trade. I think it would be well if workmen could feel that inspectors were not so much their enemies as their friends, to whom they could speak and give expression to their complaints and their desires; and I believe that thereby the Government would get very much better and truer information in reference to the trades from these inspectors than it is possible for them to obtain at the present time.

1076. But in this trade, which is divided up into innumerable branches, you would not have inspectors acquainted with each branch, would you?

No; the only three branches you would have to deal with (and a technical man would understand all) are the machining, the lasting, and the finishing. I certainly am in favour of the manufacturers finding workshops for all the workmen, but I am afraid that would not be a practical suggestion for legislation.

1077. Earl of *Onslow.*] Mr. White, in his evidence, expressed an opinion

 that

that there should be a very heavy registration fee, I think he named 5 *l.*, placed upon these workshops, with the view of prohibiting them; is that also your opinion?

No; that is a view which I cannot adopt, because it would simply mean that the poorest man could not start working, while the fellow who could borrow 10 *l.* or 5 *l.*, or who had some money, could start bigger workshops; and I would rather support the suggestion of Mr. White, that bigger sweaters' shops should not be permitted, if that could be done by law.

1078. Lord *Thring.*] I do not understand your proposal with regard to the inspection. An inspector is wanted to inspect the sanitary condition, the drainage, sewerage, and ventilation. I do not understand why a bootmaker as an inspector in a bootmaker's shop is better than a man, or as well as a man, who has been trained to inspect drainage all his life?

But I think an inspector's duties in reference to these matters should be more than simply duties with regard to the sanitary arrangements of a house.

1079. But I want to know what you meant by an inspector. What do you wish him to do; I will assume that you make a bootmaker an inspector, and that he goes into a shop in the East-end; what do you want him to do?

As I understand the object of the law is to protect the lives of the workers, I want him to see whether work is being so carried on that it is detrimental to the health and happiness of the people.

1080. *Chairman.*] You mean the sanitary conditions?

Not the sanitary conditions only, but any others.

1081. You mean the hours of labour?

That may be one thing.

1082. Lord *Thring.*] If you wish to know whether work is detrimental to health, the proper thing is, is it not, to send a doctor, not a bootmaker?

The sweating system, as I have found out, at the present time is certainly destroying the stamina, life, and happiness of men. The doctor may go in and say, "This room is in a splendid sanitary condition." What would be the use of these men attempting to explain to him their methods of work, by which their happiness was being destroyed and their lives shortened.

1083. Take the case of the Sheffield grinding trade; who found out why that was detrimental? The doctor; he found out what was the matter with the men's lungs, and that it was owing to the steel dust that came from their work. Supposing that bootmakers suffer from a particular disease incidental to their trade (I do not know whether that is the case or not), the doctor is the proper person to find that out, not the bootmaker?

Quite so. But I will give you an instance: a man goes to a chest hospital and complains of some pains in his chest (for consumption is one of the prevailing diseases), and the doctor examines him and says, "You must take very much care of yourself; eat good nourishing food, and take care of yourself;" and the man said to me, "How can I take care of myself? I have to work." The doctor only knew what the disease was. Indeed, I took the trouble to go to the London Hospital to endeavour to get some statistics in reference to this very point, and the doctor told me that they never asked the causes of a disease; all that they deal with is the disease itself; as to whence it arose, from what kind of labour, they never considered that. In this case the doctor simply told the man to take care of himself, and with that sentence of death, as I consider it was, the man had to go back to his work, and continue on the old lines.

1084. I never knew a doctor who did not inquire into the patient's habits of life, and if you sent a doctor to the bootmakers he would inquire into the habits of their life?

The doctor you gentlemen would go to would ask your habits of life; but with working men the doctor knows their modes of labour very well; he knows that it is of no use his inquiring into that.

1085. How

1085. How can a bootmaker, going into one of these shops, inquire into the diseases of the men who are working there as well as a doctor can?

I do not say that the man I am speaking of should be a doctor to them; but I do say that this man having a technical knowledge of the trade could understand whether these men were being fairly or unfairly dealt with. He could understand whether they were being rightly and justly treated under the sweating system.

1086. Do I understand you to mean that the man should inquire into their wages?

Into the whole condition of their life.

1087. But do I understand that your model inspector should inquire into the wages of the working men?

Wages, for one thing.

1088. And the relations that they bear to their masters?

Yes.

1089. And that, if he thought they were wrong, he should have power to alter them?

That I do not say.

1090. Then what would you wish him to do?

I suppose he could do the same as is being done now, report to higher authorities.

1091. And that there should be a power in the higher authorities to alter those relations of the working men to their masters?

If there is anything that is against the existing law.

1092. But if the wage were unequal, in the opinion of the presiding authority, you would wish the presiding authority to alter the wages?

If you will permit me to mention it, I have another idea in my mind, though I know it would be an innovation. At the present time any employer has the right to discharge his workmen because they happen to join a trades union; I would make it penal for any employer to discharge a workman simply because he joins a trades union. I think men ought to have a right to combine for resisting oppression.

1093. Earl of *Onslow*.] But supposing he did not give any reason for discharging him?

We do know this, that a law once passed will ultimately give a moral sanction to the thing itself.

1094. Lord *Thring*.] That depends, does it not, upon whether it is a just law or an unjust law?

It depends upon the law, but I think even the most unjust man would have to recognise that this proposed law was just in itself, however it might tell against him.

1095. But I want to know this, whether you wish to give the bootmaker whom you send in as inspector the power to consider the relations, the commercial relations, so to speak, between the master and the employés, and between the master and the manufacturer, and then to report it to some higher department, say the Board of Trade, and that the Board of Trade should have power to interfere with respect to those relations?

As to the exact details of what they should do, I am bound to admit that I have not considered them. I simply ask that the inspectors who now go, knowing nothing of the trade, should be displaced by men who have been engaged in the specific trades carried on in these workshops; by men who themselves understand the trades. As to the details of what they should actually do, I am not clear in my own mind at present.

1096. You wish that they should be displaced by men who understand the trade, in order that those inspectors should enter into the particulars of the trade, not into the sanitary condition of the house.

Exactly as Mr. White said last week, particularising the miners, that it was thought necessary for the miners to appoint miners as inspectors.

1097. That is quite a different case. They appointed miners with reference to the risk of explosion, and matters of that sort. But I am asking you about the house: you have pressed the Committee very hard that we should appoint experts or bootmakers: I want to know how the fact of a man being an expert, a bootmaker, can qualify him to be an inspector as to the sanitary condition of the work-room and the physical or constitutional condition of the workman?

At the present time, I believe, the sanitary inspector and the workshop or factory inspector are two distinct persons.

1098. I ask you the question generally; I want to know your object in proposing to appoint an expert?

My object is this: at the present time I know that there are factory inspectors who cannot find out many of the sweaters' shops which exist in the tailoring and other trades; they do not know where to find them, and they cannot get sufficiently into touch with the persons engaged in the trade, even if they do find them out. I believe that if a man with technical knowledge of the trade could get into touch with the workmen on the one side, and with the employers on the other, there would not be likely to be so much evasion; he would be able to get into all the nooks and corners of the whole of the trade.

1099. What do you mean by "the nooks and corners"?

I am informed, for instance, of a tailor's shop, a place where tailoring is being carried on, which is at the back of a butcher's shop. Now the factory inspector, I am told, does not know anything at all about that place. If he goes to the shop, it is a butcher's shop, nothing else; but at the back of the place, I am told, there is a very large workshop where girls and women are employed.

1100. Why is a bootmaker more qualified to detect a fraud in a shop; I should have thought a detective policemen would be the proper person to do it?

To illustrate my meaning, I am quite sure that if I wanted to find out anything about the boot trade I could find it out, when I could defy any tailor to find it out, because I could get into touch with the men in a way that I am quite sure a tailor would not, nor any sanitary inspector, nor a doctor.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Veneris, 20° *Aprilis*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of ONSLOW.
Viscount GORDON (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord CLINTON.
Lord CLIFFORD of CHUDLEIGH.
Lord FOXFORD (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord ROTHSCHILD.
Lord MONKSWELL.
Lord THRING.

LORD KENRY (EARL OF DUNRAVEN AND MOUNT-EARL), IN THE CHAIR.

MR. WILLIAM HOFFMAN, having been called in, is further Examined, as follows:

1101. *Chairman.*] BEFORE going to the point at which you left off last time, I want to call your attention to one or two matters; for instance, to the sanitary condition and decency of their houses. You gave us some evidence about it, but not very detailed. I presume you have visited a great many of these places?

Yes.

1102. And you must remember that the Committee have not visited them, and perhaps you would like to give us some more details. You mentioned, for instance, one case of a tailor's shop concealed behind a butcher's shop?

I heard that simply from report. I could not say that I know it from positive knowledge; but I gave that as an illustration to show that Inspectors who would come into direct contact with workers could get information that others would not be able to obtain.

1103. I will take you to that point presently; in the meantime, would you like to give the Committee any more detail about the decency and the sanitary condition of these places?

The rooms which I have visited almost invariably are very dirty and overcrowded, both as regards sleeping-rooms, and very often as regards working-rooms. I have found beds in underground cellars, and, in very many instances, in work-rooms, where children as well as adults have slept. I have reason to believe in many instances these people even take in lodgers. The whitewashing and cleansing of these rooms, of the workshops especially, is a matter that is never attended to. It is never enforced by any Factory Inspector, because Factory Inspectors never go there. Generally speaking, I should say that the sanitary condition of these places is detrimental to the health of the people, and must be very injurious, especially to child life.

1104. When you speak of them as being dirty, what do mean by dirty?

I mean that they are not whitewashed, and that the floors are not washed. I may say in one place where I went there were six persons at work; there were two women and two children; there was cooking and working going on in the same place, lots of work about, a cat and a dog, and on the floor I noticed feathers of a fowl, as if they had been plucking the feathers from a fowl, and

had simply thrown them about the floor. There is an utter absence of cleanliness; that seems to be a feature never thought of or recognised at all among these people

1105. Is there sufficient privy accommodation?
That I could not say; because, as I explained before, I went into it from a shoemakers's point of view, rather than from a sanitary inspector's point of view.

1106. Having been in the trade yourself, you thoroughly understand all the processes of it?
I think so.

1107. I wish you would explain to the Committee what I do not clearly understand; that is, the whole process which boots go through, from the time they leave the manufacturer to the time they come back to the manufacturer. The manufacturer gets an order from abroad, we will say; do any of them complete the boots entirely on their own factories?
No.

1108. In what condition do they come from them?
There are factories where all the processes except finishing are completed in the factories; there are other factories where both making and finishing are done out of doors I may say it is the usual, indeed the invariable practice in the boot trade, for the manufacturers to do the clicking and rough stuff cutting (that is, the cutting out of the upper leather and the bottom stuff) on their own premises. But then comes machining. In many instances, especially in the case of those manufacturers who employ sweating labour, the machining is done out of doors, on the person's own premises. That is invariably done by females.

1109. What is the machining?
The machining together of the various pieces which form the upper.

1110. Sewing them together, in fact?
Yes. The uppers are then taken back to the factory; the bottoms are there cut out by machine, and the upper and bottom stuff given out to the makers.

1111. The machining, you say, is sewing the various portions together?
The upper leather.

1112. By sewing machines?
The ordinary sewing machines. This is done entirely by women. In some firms in the better class of trade, it is done in-doors, but never in the common class of trade; there it is done out of doors. The uppers and bottoms are then given out to the makers in the common class shops, and these are made at home, and that is where the sweating begins, in the making department.

1113. What do you mean by "making"?
Lasting the uppers on to the last, putting on the bottoms, and putting on the heels. The boot is then taken back again to the warehouse. Then they are given out again to the finishers, which is the branch of the manufacture of boots where the greatest amount of sweating takes place. The boots are given by the manufacturers to the finishers; and these manufacturers who employ sweating labour give the boots to the master sweater. As a rule they prefer men who can do a large quantity of work; they discourage, as far as they can, all little men, men doing small quantities. Then these men take the work home and go through the process of sweating, which has been already described to your Lordships, where the knifer takes one-half and the other half is subdivided amongst the other men.

1114. Then there are three distinct processes carried out outside the factory?
Outside the manufactory in the common class trade.

1115. And in every process the work has to be taken out of the factory and brought back to the factory?
Yes.

1116. What

1116. What is the reason why the manufacturers discourage, as you say, the small men?

For this reason; that the men who employ large teams must have large quantities of work, and these men, requiring large quantities of work, very frequently offer to take the work for less money; or, especially in slack times, they are very squeezable. A manufacturer says, "I have not much work; I can give you work if you will take it for less money." The man employing large teams is always ready, and very often compelled, to take less money in order to obtain large quantities of work. I have this information not only from the men themselves but also from employers of labour to whom the offers have been made.

1117. We have heard that in slack times orders come very irregularly from the manufacturers, and it has been suggested that the manufacturer does it on purpose in order to keep down prices, by giving the impression that he has very little work to put out; is that the case?

From my own knowledge I could not say so; but, as I said before upon this point, from what I have heard and know of the character of some of these men, I should be prepared to believe even that, but I could not speak from positive knowledge.

1118. Do you know at all how the manufacturer gets orders?

Usually by going to the wholesale houses, factors; for instance, factors in Manchester, it may be, or in Liverpool, and so on; and I may say that I was speaking to a small manufacturer this morning who told me of a very large sweating firm here in London that supplies a large house in Liverpool, where other men cannot get orders, because he bribes the buyer.

1119. Who bribes the buyer?

The manufacturer up here bribes the buyer down there, at Liverpool. They also send out travellers, and they constantly compete with one another at the point of price. I may say, there are a class of manufacturers in the boot trade having no technical knowledge of the boot trade, and taking no pride in their productions, and the only way in which they can compete is simply and purely at the point of price. The leather is no cheaper to them than to any other person in the trade; therefore they can only take it out of labour, out of the wages of their men; and it is to this kind of competition that the sweating system lends itself very easily.

1120. Now, with regard to these large houses, such as the one you mentioned at Liverpool, how do they get their orders; direct from abroad?

No; the firm that I am referring to now have very many retail shops of their own.

1121. That is for the home trade?

Yes.

1122. But is not the bulk of those sweating goods used for export?

I should not say the bulk; considerable quantities.

1123. How do they get the orders for the export trade?

Usually from shipping houses here, through agents here.

1124. In your recollection were there more English employed in the boot trade than there are now in the East-end of London?

I should say so.

1125. You think that they have been driven out by the Jewish workmen?

Undoubtedly; that is true, in the commoner class trade especially.

1126. But the English are largely employed in London; if not in the East-end, in the other parts?

There are a great number employed in London; but you must know that there are some provincial towns where the boot industry is very extensive indeed, and, as a rule, many of these men travel backwards and forwards to Northampton, Leicester, Stafford, Norwich, and such places.

1127. I want to find out from you what effect, if any, this sweating system has had upon the English people employed in the boot trade?

Certainly that branch of the trade where the men are not protected by what are called statements of wages has been affected by it.

1128. What is a "statement of wages"?

A list of wages drawn up by the trades' unionists, which they compel the employers to pay; there are two such statements in existence in London at the present time. There is what is termed a first-class statement and a second-class statement. May I be permitted to explain the meaning? The first-class statement was the first statement of wages drawn up by the workmen; it may be some 16 or 17 years ago. At that time the best class trade was in the hands of a limited number of manufacturers in London. They were able to pay a high wage. The wages for these firms were at that time fixed by this statement. After that, another section of manufacturers made similar best goods to the first-class houses, and the workmen issued a second-class statement, by which manufacturers could make similar goods, making and finishing at about 3*d.* per pair less. For a time this worked fairly well; but ultimately the third section of manufacturers competed very closely with the second-class manufacturers in the market in the production of better class goods. The effect this has had upon the first-class employers is, that the second-class employers gradually got hold of nearly the bulk of the trade of the first-class employers; some of the first-class employers to-day are simply becoming factors because they cannot manufacture to compete with the second-class manufacturers, their hands being tied by the workmen. The second-class employers find themselves now in exactly a similar position; they find themselves severely handicapped by those manufacturers who are not paying to any fixed rate of wages. A great deal of this, I would say here, has been brought about, and a great deal of harm to the London boot trade has been done, by the action of the trades' unionists in this matter, by fettering some 24 firms (there are only about 24 firms that are working under a statement), tying the hands of these firms, and leaving others at liberty to work at what prices they please. I may say the system is this: trades' unionists do not say that such and such boots shall be paid for at so much by every man who makes them, but practically they say to the workmen: "Whenever you go to work in this or that house you must ask so much for the work you are making, but when you go anywhere else you can make it for whatever you please." London trades' unionists have no objection to make a boot for one man at a certain price; but when they go into another house, and make the very self same thing, they would not make it for the same price.

1129. How do you account for that apparently arbitrary proceeding on the part of the trades unionists?

As a rule, the men who are employed in first and second-class houses are what one might term the aristocracy of the trade, and they simply look after what they conceive to be their own interests. As a rule, the bulk of the men working in the lower section of the shops are not trades unionists, the great bulk of them are not, and therefore the first and second-class men have not very much sympathy with these; but I may say that for some very considerable time in London amongst employers and workmen there has been great dissatisfaction with existing arrangements, because a considerable number of employers among the first and second-class houses are leaving London, and taking their plant and business down to Northampton. The suggestion that I would make in reference to this matter, that I believe would abolish ultimately the whole of the sweating system, and would be a relief to the whole of the London manufacturers, is that there should be a similar arrangement to that which was accepted and entered into at Northampton last year. There employers and workmen, after considerable conflict, have agreed that there shall be an uniform rate of wages, that is, that a certain boot of a certain description is worth so much making, whether it is made for A. or for Z. By this means competition cannot be carried on at the point of price, which is exacted simply from the wages of the men.

1130. Why

1130. Why are these London first-class houses going down to Northampton?
Because there they are able to produce their goods under the Northampton arrangement at a lesser rate of wages than they are compelled to pay up here.

1131. That is to say, that the trades unionists in London insist upon a higher rate of wages than the trades unionists in Northampton; is that so?
That is hardly so. As I have explained, the trades unionists of London simply say that at a limited number of houses the men must ask so much, but they can go to any other houses and make them for what they please; houses, that is, not working under a statement.

1132. I do not understand by that why the London house is worse off than the Northampton house?
Undoubtedly the Northampton rate of wages is not so high as the first class statement of London, not by any means, but the average rate of wages there is higher than in London.

1133. Earl of *Limerick*.] But it is the first-class houses that are going to Northampton, as I understand you?
And the second-class houses also.

1134. Earl of *Onslow*.] As I understand, how a trades union could be maintained in Northampton; but I want to know how you think that a similar trades union could be maintained in London, where, as I understand, the competition for work is so very much greater?
But in Northampton it was actually the same to some extent; in slack times, at all events, manufacturers there used to take advantage of their workmen exactly as they do up here; but by this uniform rate of wages that is now established that is made impossible.

1135. Can you tell us how it was brought about, the steps that were taken by the workmen in Northampton?
It was the result of a strike that took place. The strike lasted for, I think, over three months, and both employers and workmen ultimately came to the conclusion that the best arrangement that they could possibly come to would be this uniform rate of wages, and the establishment of an arbitration board, by whom all questions should be decided.

1136. But do you think that it would be praticable to do such a thing in London?
Yes; and there are a large section of London manufacturers who would be quite prepared; in fact they are anxious to enter into a similar arrangement.

1137. Notwithstanding all the difficulties we have heard of, difficulties of language, and difficulties caused by the constant arrival of new comers in the trade?
Undoubtedly, yes.

1138. I should like to hear your reasons for saying that?
You must understand that the men who have given evidence here about a trades unions existing in the trade, only represent a Jewish trades union; there is a very strong workmen's union in London which is an English trades union.

1139. But do not the Jews and the English compete in the same class of labour?
In the common trade, yes; but the Jewish workmen would be quite prepared now to co-operate with English trades unionists so far as they are able.

1140. I quite understand that they would be very willing to do so if they could; but what I should like you to point out to the Committee, if you can, is what practical steps ought to be adopted in order to form a trades union of English and of Jews, which would be able to maintain prices in the way you say has been done at Northampton?
At Northampton it is an agreement on the part of employers as well as workmen.

1141. *Chairman.*] Is it the case that at Northampton the trade is entirely in the hands of the English?

No, not exclusively.

1142. Is the trade at Northampton subjected to influences that have been mentioned to us; for instance, the constant arrival of what are called greeners?

I should say not; not to the same extent.

1143. Would not that in itself make the circumstances of Northampton very different?

Yes; undoubtedly it would be more difficult to grapple with this constant influx of greeners; I can see a difficulty there, undoubtedly.

1144. But still you think the same system could be applied in London as has been applied in Northampton?

Yes, I do.

1145. I should like to recall you for one moment to the general point. I asked you the effect of the sweating system upon the English; I mean whether many of them have been driven out of the trade in London, and what has become of them, and whether they have been driven out of the trade in Northampton, and any other centres of the boot trade?

The general effect it has is this; that instead of there being a constancy of employment, or some degree of constancy of employment, as used to be the case some years ago, work now is scarcer; that is, men have not that same constant employment.

1146. By "men" you mean Englishmen?

I mean Englishmen. Instead of being employed full time it is scarcely the case for four or five months of the year that the men have full employment; at other times their employment would be perhaps three-quarters, or even half time.

1147. Has that been caused by Jewish competition, do you think?

That is my firm conviction, especially in the commoner class trade.

1148. Is the Jewish competition affecting Northampton also?

So far as goods are sent from here down to Northampton and other provincial towns.

1149. But are they sent from here down to Northampton?

Not to Northampton direct, because the boots manufactured at Northampton are not consumed at Northampton, but they are sent to various parts of the country: for instance, I was at Manchester some five or six weeks ago, and I found then that at Manchester there are no boot manufacturers; they are all factors; goods are bought by factors; I found that Manchester bought very largely from Northampton, Leicester, and Stafford. I happened to get into coversation with a retailer there, and he told me that he used to buy from Northampton, but the competition amongst the retailers down there was so keen at the point of price that he had to send up to London where he could buy goods cheaper, mentioning one of these sweater firms. He said, "I do not like the London goods, they do not give me such satisfaction, but I can get them at a lower price." It is in this way that the sweating system in London affects even Northampton, and Leicester, and other places; and I have had other instances of the same kind.

1150. I gather from you that the sweating system, as far as the boot trade is concerned, is confined principally to Jews?

Undoubtedly.

1151. But that their competition is affecting the English bootmakers, not only in London, but more or less all over the country?

Undoubtedly.

1152. And you think that a remedy to some extent would be found by the action, or creation, of a trades union in London?

Yes; that is a matter that must be left entirely to the workmen and the employers.

1153. Lord

1153. Lord *Thring.*] I understand you to say, first of all, that there are three classes in London of the employers, the first class, the second class, and the third; and then I understand you to say that there are two statements of wages in London; a first class and a second class, and no statement applying to a third class?
None at all.

1154. Do we really understand that in the first and second classes the actual houses are named to whom these statements of wages apply?
Yes.

1155. Then what I understand is this, that there is a list of houses to which the statements of wages apply in London, first and second class, but that beyond those two lists of houses there is no statement of wages, and no trades union applying to bootmaking in London?
No; there are no other fixed statements of wages. What does exist is this, that in some houses the workmen themselves, with their employer, have agreed that a certain price shall be paid for his goods; but the point is this, that the wages of some houses are fixed, arbitrarily fixed, by the trades union.

1156. But what I want to get at is this: do I understand you that the houses that are fixed are named houses; for instance, are there 20 houses in the first class and 100 houses in the second class?
I think there are six or seven in the first, and 17 or 18 in the second.

1157. Then, beyond the six or seven in the first class, and the 17 or 18 in the second class, there are no statements of wages?
No fixed uniform statements of wages.

1158. Then, suppose one of these first-class houses ceases to work, do they put in another; suppose that Mr. Jones is one of the seven houses you have mentioned, and suppose Mr. Jones dies, and his business is either disposed of or ceases altogether, what happens?
Nothing; the firm simply lapses.

1159. But what happens with the statement of wages; do they substitute another house?
No.

1160. Then, after a short time, the number of houses to which the statement of wages applies is so extremely limited that it could have no effect upon the general trade; there are only, as I understand it, 17 and seven; those are all the houses in London to which the trade unionism applies?
So far as the fixing of first and second-class statements is concerned, yes.

1161. Except with regard to those, there is no fixing of wages at all?
No.

1162. Then do I understand you to say that you think that, by any possible means, the wages of the third class could be fixed at the same price as the second class?
No, undoubtedly not; and if a uniform statement of wages was arranged it would probably be below either the first or second.

1163. It would be classified?
Yes.

1164. Supposing you had your way, how many classification of wages would you make in the bootmaking trade?
As many as there are classes or qualities of boots.

1165. *Chairman.*] Will you explain that?
A description would be given of what constitutes a best boot. I may say, they have at Northampton a case of sample boots.

1166. Lord *Thring.*] "First-class," will you call them?
From the very lowest to the very highest.

1167. How many classes of boots have they got?
That I could not say; I do not know; there may perhaps be 10 or 12.

1168. Then is your proposition that the Northampton list, whatever you call it, should be made universal throughout London; is that what you propose?
That the principle should be adopted. I should say that there would be a slight addition to the Northampton prices; the principle I would adopt.

1169. Throughout England?
Throughout England; as far as London is concerned, at all events, others would follow.

1170. As a general rule, you think the Northampton price list should be the universal list throughout England, and that that should be carried into effect by a universal trades union?
Yes; but for the words "price list" in your question I would beg to put the "Northampton principle."

1171. *Chairman.*] You do not mean that the price obtaining at Northampton should obtain all over England?
No, for the simple reason that the cost of living in London is higher than at Northampton.

1172. Lord *Thring.*] Where, speaking generally, do you think that these Jewish greeners who are exercising, in your opinion, so bad an influence on the trade, would range in your list of prices?
At the very lowest end, and very probably be squeezed out altogether.

1173. Earl of *Onslow.*] I quite appreciate the advantages which would accrue from what you suggest; but what I want to get from you is, how far you think it would be practicable; we have had a good deal of evidence here that the moment a trades union is formed, and the moment a price is arranged, a ship-load of Polish or Russian Jews arrive who are not in the trades union, and who are prepared to take the work at a lower price; how would you contend with that difficulty?
It would right itself in this way: that when an employer is compelled to pay a larger wage he is sure to demand the greatest amount of labour that he can get for that money; and, supposing a man who now pays 2 *d.* was compelled to pay 3 *d.*, you would find that he would want threepence' worth of labour, and he would not employ these men; he would say, "Your work is not sufficiently good for me."

1174. Then the result of that would be that they would get no work at all?
Quite so, until they had qualified themselves as good workmen.

1175. *Chairman.*] How could they qualify themselves?
They would have to learn, I suppose.

1176. Earl of *Onslow.*] Then the greeners would not be able to get any work at all, and would not come at all
Quite so.

1177. Do you really think that it would be possible to get all the master bootmakers in London to bind themselves to such a contract, knowing that there were constantly men arriving in London who were prepared to do this work?
I believe that the great bulk of the London manufacturers would be prepared to do so, and I think that they would exercise sufficient moral influence over others to bring them in also ultimately; it has had that effect at Northampton.

1178. Then might not the result of that be to increase the retail price of boots?
Undoubtedly it would.

1179. And do you not think that that would injuriously affect our export trade?
I think not, because I do not think that the increase of prices would be so extraordinarily great.

1180. Lord

1180. Lord *Monkswell.*] I should like to ask you one or two questions about this. Do I understand you to say that you think the sweating system exists in Northampton at all?

No, not to my knowledge.

1181. But I understand now that work is leaving London for Northampton, so that there is a great deal of work in Northampton; but do you think that your system would bear the strain of slack work in Northampton; could it be kept up in the face of slack work?

It is kept up by a mutual understanding. I may say that the employers have entered into an agreement amongst themselves that they shall be loyal to this arrangement.

1182. How long has this been going on?

About three months, I think; it is a new arrangement.

1183. The work has not been slack in Northampton since?

Yes, it was during the slack time when the arrangement was entered into.

1184. I do not understand why these greeners should not get some sort of wages for making boots, because, as I understand, in the system of Northampton a particular class of boot costs a certain price, and of that price so much must go in labour?

No, the boot manufacturers do not say that.

1185. But if the cost of a boot is said to be 10 *s.*, I suppose it amounts to this, that a certain sum of that 10 *s.* goes in labour?

Yes.

1186. The boots are made partly through the labour of greeners now in London?

Yes, the common-class trade.

1187. The greener would do a certain amount of work that would have to go into these bad boots. I do not understand why a greener should not come over from abroad and be paid in exact proportion to the value of the work he does, just as any other man in Northampton?

Yes, but what I would say is this: that the bulk of them are not sufficiently qualified workmen, or they would not be, under a higher rate of wages, able to obtain the same employment they do now.

1188. But these boots must be made somehow; a greener's work is made useful somehow?

Undoubtedly it is.

1189. I do not quite understand the difficulty, I confess. The greener would still come over; he would still be employed; his work is less valuable, and he would be paid less wages. I want to know how the wages are fixed. I understand that a certain class of boots is to be made, and according to the Northampton programme a certain amount of money must be paid for the making of that class of boot. I suppose in a certain time the greener could turn out, or help in turning out, such boots?

Yes, if he could qualify himself.

1190. And might not a greener be employed by people who could direct him what to do; might you not get another sort of sweating system as between the ordinary worker and the greener; could not six men, for instance, combine together and work with greeners, and say, "We get so much for producing a certain number of pairs of boots; here are a dozen greeners; they are worth very little, but they can help us, and we will pay them at the rate of 1 *s.* a day"?

There might be such a possibility, but you may depend upon it a union amongst these men themselves would ultimately right that. So far as manufacturers are concerned, my position is this: that if an employer was compelled to pay 4 *d.* for a certain boot for which now he only pays 2 *d.*, he would want more skilful labour put into that boot.

1191. There was one observation you made as to the cost of living; you said you could not have an uniform rate of wages, because the cost of living was higher in some places than in others. I do not quite see how you can work that out?

That is an arrangement that must be absolutely left in the hands of workmen and employers; it is a point which cannot be legislated for, and London employers are quite prepared to accept the Northampton principle, and to put some additional price upon the statement on account of the extra cost of living.

1192. Lord *Rothschild.*] I do not know that I quite understood what you said. You state that some of the London manufacturers have migrated to Northampton?

Yes.

1193. I suppose they migrate to Northampton because they can carry on the trade better there?

It is to escape the thraldom of the first and second-class statements; to-day they are being handicapped by men who are not bound hand and foot; and to throw off their fetters they are going to Northampton.

1194. Would not that rather point to the fact that they can make their boots much more cheaply at Northampton?

Undoubtedly, because they feel themselves bound improperly by these restrictions.

1195. If they make them more cheaply at Northampton, they will pay lower wages?

Yes; but the workmen themselves do not earn less money.

1196. Will you explain how that can be; they must work longer hours or they must earn less money?

Yes, but not unduly long. The trade of the employers working under the first and second-class statements is confined to a very limited area in London; commoner classes of work they cannot touch, because the statement demands from them so high a rate of wages, with this result, that the orders in the course of a twelvemonth to the first and second-class employers are fluctuating, more so than they are to the employers who are not restricted by the first and second-class statement, with this result: I have had myself to discharge, many and many a time, workmen because of slackness of trade, and the men have had to go from our place, and they have gone into some other place that was making work we could have made if we had not been restricted by the statement. So that those places which are restricted by the first and second-class statements are on half and three-quarter time, whereas in other places where there is no restriction they are on full time very often.

1197. You say that the manufacturer can get his goods made more cheaply in Northampton, and at the same time you say that the competition at Manchester and elsewhere between the sweating-system-made boots and the Northampton boots is so great that the sweating-system-made boots have an advantage; I want those facts reconciled; I do not see how they can be reconciled at all?

When speaking of the London boot trade you may divide it into two; the one is the better-class trade, and the other a very common-class trade. When I speak of London boots competing with Northampton, Leicester, and Stafford, I am referring to the goods made by the manufacturers, of whom there are some 20 or 30, by whom the sweating system is carried on; it is not in the first-class trade; Northampton, Stafford, and Leicester are competing with London in the better-class goods.

1198. Earl of *Limerick.*] Then, as I understand you, what you really suggest is, that work should be paid for in accordance with the class of the work, and not in accordance with statements of wages applicable to certain firms; is not that the effect of your evidence?

Yes; I think work should be paid for according to the classes of work, not, as it

it is at the present time with those employing sweaters, according to the hungry condition or destitution of the workpeople.

1199. I am alluding now to what you said about these statements of wages, and I understood you to say that you thought that the payments should be, not in accordance with statements of wages affecting only certain firms, but in accordance with the classes of work generally?

Yes. Instead of saying, as they do at the present time, "This man, that, and the other shall pay such prices," they should say this, "This boot, that boot, and the other are worth so much, and whoever makes them must pay these wages."

1200. And I think you said that, owing to the present statements of wages in London, certain firms that were subject to them were changing their place of manufacture to Northampton?

That is so.

1201. Where a different system is established, I presume, by the trades union?

Yes, by mutual consent of the men on the one hand and the employers on the other.

1202. Then do you think that a similar system to that which exists in Northampton could be brought about in London by the action of the trades union?

Yes, by the trades union on the one hand and the employers on the other?

1203. But with regard to the system by which certain firms have to pay in accordance with statements of wages; has not that been brought about by the London trades unionists?

Yes, without the consent of the employers.

1204. How then do you think that the trades unionists in London would be induced to do what you consider wise in future?

There are two reasons. When these statements were made several years ago the condition of the trade was not what it is now, and the statements did not work so injuriously then as they do now.

1205. Still, at the same time, the trades union have not modified that?

No. I may say that they are not at all unanimous in keeping up the system as it stands at the present time. I believe by ventilating this matter, and getting it before them, that they would be prepared to accept the Northampton system.

1206. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Supposing the Northampton system was in existence in London at the present moment, would there not be this difference between the two places, that in Northampton, there being no greeners, or comparatively few greeners coming in, there would be very litte temptation for new firms to start up, because it would be so difficult for them to get labour; but in London, in consequence of the accession of greeners, it would be very easy for fresh firms to start and work outside the union, employing neither union men nor being themselves bound by union rules?

If trades unionism was not discouraged, as it is to-day, by discharging men; if men were allowed to join unions without intimidation, I feel convinced that sufficient pressure would be brought to bear upon any men who would go to work for such firms as you describe to deter them from doing it.

1207. What I mean is, could not these new firms work entirely with greener labour?

I should think not.

1208. So as to be wholly outside the union?

I should think not.

1209. *Chairman.*] Could you give the Committee the names of these few houses that are subject to the first and second statements of wages?

Yes. Those that are subject to first-class statements are: Stubbs & Grimsdall,

Grimsdall, Bath-buildings, Baldwin-street, E.C.; R. Mountford, 18, Bethnal Green-road, E.; J. Markie, Tabernacle-street, E.C.; J. W. Chapman, Tabernacle-street, E.C.; C. Silverthorne, junior, Cowper-street, Finsbury, E.C.; P. Lehany, Leonard-street, Finsbury, E.C.; S. Harrison, Gray's Inn-road, W.C.; J. H. Baker, 345, Hackney-road, E.; Silverthorn & Son, Great Cambridge-street, E. Those that are subject to second-class statements are: James Branch, 19, Bethnal Green-road, E.; John Branch, Bethnal Green-road, E.; Britten & Bannister, 385, Hackney-road, E.; A. & G. Escott, Twemlow-terrace, London-fields, E.; Henry Garbold, Goldsmiths-row, E.; L. Knowles, 2A, Sigdon-road, Dalston, E.; W. J. Lorkins & Co., High-street, Homerton, E.; Potter & Lee, 19, Old Ford-road, E.; Chambers, Hoxton, E.; Thomas Watts, Myrtle-Street, Hoxton, E.; Solomons, Hackney-road, E.; J. Bassford, New-road, City-road, E.C.; Pike, Printing House-square, E.; Turner, Edgware-road, W.; Cooper, Mare-street, Hackney, E.

1210. Could you furnish the Committee with a list?
I will send it.

1211. Could you explain why these particular houses have been singled out in particular?
Because at one time, as I explained, they were making the best goods in London, and then, when they were making these best goods, the first-class statement was drawn up; but since then the whole trade has been revolutionised, so to speak; prices are lower, and competition has affected them very seriously. It is an old law, which was comparatively good at the time when it was enacted, but it is not suitable to these times.

1212. And what has taken place among these first-class people in London, where they are dealt with exceptionally, is this, that they are inclined to go to Northampton, where everybody is more or less under the same system?
Yes, quite so.

1213. And I understand you that the competition in the best class of goods is between the provinces and London; that is to say, London is affected by the competition in the provinces?
Yes.

1214. But that in the cheap goods the provinces are affected by the competition in London?
Yes; the provinces cannot touch London for cheap goods made by the sweaters.

1215. Do these first and second class statements apply to the bootmakers, say, in the West End of London, not the wholesale manufacturer of the boot, but to ordinary bootmakers?
The bespoke makers? No, they have arrangements of their own; there is no difficulty amongst those.

1216. You spoke just now of union men being discharged or intimidated, because they belonged to a union?
Yes.

1217. Is that within your personal knowledge?
I have had it from many men that they have been discharged on the plea that they belonged to unions, called agitators, and so on.

1218. Now the general tendency of the evidence before the Committee has been that, up to within about eight or ten years ago, the ready-made boot trade was in a fairly prosperous condition, but the great evils complained of have arisen during that period latterly. How do you account for that; how do you account for the aggravation of the present system which appears to have taken place in the last eight years; is it to be accounted for, for instance, by improvement in machinery?
I should say that machinery has something to do with it; it makes it easy for men who have no technical knowledge to start manufacturing, employing a few hands who have technical knowledge, and then use the whole concern simply for the purpose of grinding money out of those whom they employ; and to a very large extent also it is due to the excessive immigration of these foreigners, of whom you have had samples before you.

1219. You

1219. You would say that improved machinery and immigration are among the causes?

Undoubtedly.

1220. Then you complained the other day about the want of proper inspection?

Yes.

1221. I want to bring you back to that point. You understand that, speaking generally, legislation does not interfere with adult male labour?

No.

1222. And, speaking generally, it does not interfere with a trade, unless there is something special or dangerous in the nature of that trade. What I want to hear from you is, whether you think that there is anything in the condition of the boot trade in London that calls for any special legislation, and if so, why?

I could not say that I could suggest any special legislation.

1223. I do not want you to suggest the nature of the legislation, but I want to know whether you think there is anything in the trade that ought to make it the subject of special legislation; can it be considered a dangerous trade in any way?

Dangerous to health; so far as these men are allowed to work in large teams, and for an unlimited number of hours, it is detrimental to their health, and detrimental of course to the trade financially.

1224. Do you think that the trade is in such a condition that special legislation is necessary?

I think so, for the purpose of suppressing these sweaters' dens.

1225. Would you not have to apply it to the trade all over England?

That I could hardly answer; I should think not.

1226. Could you tell the Committee whether you think you could confine it to any particular district?

I would confine it, as has been explained, to rooms which are used as workshops. I would bring them within the workshops' regulations.

1227. As to the hours of labour, you mean?

As to the hours of labour, and the sanitary conditions, and so forth.

1228. But how can you confine it to any particular part of London or to any particular city?

I do not think that we should confine it to any particular part of London or any city. I consider that with regard to all rooms that are used as workshops, the workshops' regulations should be made to apply to them.

1229. Do you mean as far as sanitary inspection goes, or do you mean that the legislation limiting the hours of labour of women and children should be extended to adult males in the boot trade?

I do; because adult males, especially the men described under the sweating system, are equally as helpless as females and children.

1230. Then further, I want to know how you are going to limit it to the East End of London or to London; how are you going to avoid extending it to the boot trade all over the United Kingdom?

So far as my knowledge goes I do not think that the boot trade is being carried on in a similar way in any part of the country to what it is in London.

1231. I will leave that point; I want to ask you now about the sanitary inspection; that you consider to be deficient?

Very much so.

1232. In the first place, have you considered whether putting these workshops into a better sanitary condition will have the effect of raising rent?

I should hardly think so, because the rents that are being paid by most of these people are enormous even now. One house one man lived in, containing six rooms, a small house, he was paying 21 *s.* a week; he sub-let some of it; but for two rooms rents are paid of 8 *s.* and 8 *s.* 6 *d.* per week.

1233. Do you think that if a landlord were compelled to lay out money upon his house he would not recoup himself by charging an increased rent?

Very probably he would.

1234. If he did, would not that tend either to increase the cost of production or to lower the rate of wages?

I do not think so, for many of the men who start in the business, that is the business of sweating other men's wages, would find that they could not afford to start in business; they would probably have to attempt to get work indoors at the factory.

1235. But if these men have to pay a higher rent, how can they do so except by working for less wages; I mean if the small employers, the knifers, have to pay higher rents for their rooms, how can they afford to do so except by cutting down the wages of the men who work under them?

I do not think they would have any reason to cut down the wages of the men under them, because already they are receiving by far too large a share of the wages; they are getting three and four times as much as the journeymen who work for them.

1236. But they naturally, if they had to pay more rent, would try and take it out of the men who work for them?

At the present time there is existing amongst the men a society, and they are agitating for the purpose of combination for the purpose of improving their condition. I believe that this discontent amongst themselves would right that.

1237. Do you believe that if the knifers had to pay higher rent the men employed by them would be strong enough to resist the attempt to lower their wages?

Undoubtedly I do.

1238. And do not you think that the cost of production would be increased by their having to pay higher rent?

To a very trifling extent, I think. It would come out of the earnings of the knifers; those men who are receiving too great a share of the wages.

1239. Now you told the Committee the other day that the sanitary inspectors, apparently, could not find these sweating dens, that they were concealed all about the place, and also that you were of opinion that sanitary inspectors should possess technical knowledge; do you propose that sanitary inspection in the East End of London should be carried out by practical bootmakers, practical tailors, practical cabinet-makers, and so on?

In the first place, I do not use the term sanitary inspector; or if I did, I did not intend to; I meant inspectors of workshops.

1240. You mean inspectors under the Factory Act?

Yes.

1241. Then what I have said applies to them. Have not you said that you think they ought to have technical knowledge?

Yes, that is my firm conviction.

1242. Lord *Thring*.] Then I understood you to say that you thought a practical bootmaker would be a better sanitary inspector for the purpose of ascertaining the health of the men than any other person?

The answer I made was that I was under the impression that the purpose of inspecting workshops was, not only to see that the sanitary condition of the workshops is good, but that the men generally, their interests generally as workmen employed there, are protected, looked after.

1243. I will repeat a question which I put to you, I think, on the former occasion; I asked you whether you thought that the inspector, by which I mean this expert, ought to have any legislative power, or administrative power, given him to interfere between the workmen and the employer with respect to wages?

Not at all.

1244. Then what would you wish him to do?

I would wish him to do exactly as those inspectors do now, but do not do efficiently, in my opinion; that is, that they would be able to supply the Government with reports as to the actual condition of these people, from a technical point of view all round.

1245. I understand

1245. I understand then that you would have the factory inspector, supposing he came into one of these sweating workshops, report, for the information of the Government, that the relations between the employer and the workman were not good, and go into the same sort of evidence as you have been giving us.

Yes, that is one of the things; and also, as I stated, a man knowing something about the trade, the employers on the one hand, and the workmen on the other, could get into places that an ordinary inspector could not.

1246. He would have (as you rightly expressed it), you thought, the confidence of the men, and therefore would be able to get information from them that would not be supplied to another man?

Yes.

1247. Earl of *Onslow.*] In your view, the duties of these inspectors should be chiefly detective, and that men who have had experience in all the dodges and evasions of the sweating system are therefore best suited for the work?

Yes.

1248. Earl of *Limerick.*] Do you think that in many cases the sanitary inspectors are afraid of being too zealous in their labours?

Yes, I think so. I understand the question in this sense; that the sanitary inspectors are afraid now to give information in reference to the sanitary condition of many dwellings.

1249. Are there any influences affecting the sanitary inspectors which might induce them not to be zealous in all cases in carrying out their inspection?

Seeing that indirectly they are under the control of vestries, and seeing that vestries are very largely composed of property owners, I should be quite prepared to believe that sanitary inspectors would be somewhat fearful of giving the true condition of things.

1250. Then would you suggest that the sanitary inspector should be appointed by any other authority?

Yes; I think he should not be under the influence of vestries or boards of works, or anything of the kind.

1251. *Chairman.*] You think he should be an imperial officer?

Undoubtedly, I do.

1252. Earl of *Limerick.*] Or an officer of a local county authority, or a local authority of an enlarged district, should that ever be created by Act of Parliament?

Yes; I think that would be sufficiently large to leave these men free.

1253. *Chairman.*] I understand from you that the direction in which you look for a remedy is by increasing wages by means of the combination among the men who earn the wages, and a better sanitary condition of things being arrived at by a more efficient system of inspection?

Yes.

1254 Have you considered whether the cost of production must not be more or less increased by the better sanitary condition of the houses, which would mean additional rent, and by a higher rate of wages; and if so, whether you have carefully considered whether that increase in the cost of production would have any effect upon the export trade?

Undoubtedly the improvement suggested would to some extent increase the cost of production. I do not believe that it would influence our export trade to any serious extent.

1255. Are we in competition for the colonial trade with any foreign countries?

We are; but the class of goods made by the sweaters' shops generally are such as are not made by other countries; they are usually goods of a superior make.

1256. Lord *Thring.*] I should like to ask you this question: I understand you to mean that doing away with the sweating system would practically crush out and destroy the inferior class of bootmakers; in other words, that the cheapest boots would cease to be made; the slop boots I think they are called?

The cheap boots would still continue to be made; but instead of being sold as they are now, at about 3*s.* 11*d.*, the cost would be perhaps about 4*s.* 3*d.* or 4 *s.* 6 *d.* retail.

1257. Then I do not understand how they could sell them at that price; they could not sell slop goods at a higher price than they get for them now, could they?

They would not be made so badly as they are now, because the manufacturer would demand a little more labour, a little more skill.

1258. But I am asking you whether it is not your opinion that the very inferior goods made now ought to be no longer made; you say yourself that they would make better goods?

When I say better goods, I mean that you would have exactly the same kind of material, only that the style of making would be better; the workmanship, the skill.

1259. I will tell you the object of my question: Do you or do you not think that supposing we required, either in the way you suggest or some way or other, that a certain class of boots should be made better, it is possible that that trade of making bad boots would go to Germany or some country abroad?

No, Germany could not produce the rubbish that is being produced here by sweaters.

1260. Earl of *Onslow.*] You said, I think, just now, that you would be prepared to restrict the extension of the operation of the Factory Acts to male adults to a limited area, the East End of London for instance?

I would apply it wherever the sweating system prevails.

1261. Do not you think that the result of that would be simply to drive the sweating system out of that particular area, and that it would take up its abode in another area?

I think the Act would follow it.

1262. Then your Act would have not to confine itself to an area but to a trade, wherever that trade might go?

To a system; I would apply it to the sweating system.

1263. Then another of the remedies that you suggested was that there should be, as I understand, a registration of these workshops?

Yes.

1264. Do you propose to affix a heavy fee to the registration?

None at all; I do not think that a fee would operate advantageously at all.

1265. Your only object in the registration would be to know where these workshops were?

Yes.

1266. Can you suggest any practical way in which registration could be carried out; because naturally these people could not come a very long distance from their abodes for the purpose of registration?

I think that might be met if every employer of labour forwarded the names of the persons working for him to some authority by letter.

1267. But you have to consider the question not only of the employers of labour but of the families who are working together, because I understand that you would include them among the workshops?

Yes.

1268. Where should they go to register the workshop?

I cannot say that I have considered that; that is a matter of detail, I think, which would be easily arranged. I have not considered that at all, but simply the main principle.

1269. You are aware of the existing powers of the sanitary inspector, are you not?

Yes, I have had them defined to me by a sanitary inspector. He told me when coming once to our workshop that he should not interfere excepting in cases

cases where the drains or similar things were detrimental to health; that he had had no power to interfere; all that he came to see was that children were not employed within certain prohibited hours, and so on.

1270. I must ask you if you understand clearly the difference between an inspector under the Factory Act, an Imperial Home Office inspector under the Factory Act, and a sanitary inspector under the local authority?
I am afraid I do not sufficiently.

1271. *Chairman.*] There is one further question I want to ask you; do you know how the knifers are paid their wages; are they paid on delivery of their goods at the shop?
The master sweaters you mean?

1272. The small master sweaters?
The practice varies. In some shops they are paid every time they take their work home; in other shops they are paid once a week.

1273. Are any deductions made that you are aware of?
Very frequently deductions are made, deductions for very trivial offences; if a button happens to fall off a pair of boots, or a string happens to break, or a sock inside the boot is not exactly as it should be, upon very trivial offence fines are inflicted, of a halfpenny, a penny, or twopence. I have seen an instance in a man's work book where, in the course of six consecutive shoppings, the money that had been deducted amounted to 3 *s.* 2½ *d.* I asked him what it was for. He said, "anything, if the sock is wrong, and so on." I asked him, "Is there any definite list of fines?" He said, "No, it just depends what temper he is; if he is bad-tempered he stops a lot; if he is good-tempered he does not stop so much." Again, very frequently, as I am informed, these men's stoppages are made, or tickets are given them for the purpose of subscribing to some charitable institution.

1274. Do you mean that part of their wages are deducted and given to a charitable institution?
Yes. For instance, an employer will give his workman two tickets at 1 *s.* each; that is 2 *s.* stopped; no question is asked as to whether he will agree to it; coal tickets, bread tickets, and similar things. But the worst feature that I have seen in reference to stoppages, or binding men to employers, I think, is this: the deduction from men's wages of 2 *s.*, or 2 *s.* 6 *d.*, or 5 *s.* a week, which has to be left in the hands of the employer. I may give a man's statement. I was in one man's place, and he was showing me some very heavy work he had to finish, for which he obtained 2¾ *d.*

1275. That was the knifer, the master?
That was the master. That had to be divided between the lot. The wife said, "It is a very bad price; I told my husband to take them back"; he said, "I cannot take them back; if I do I lose my money." I said, "What do you mean?" He said, "He has got my money"; and when I asked him for an explanation, he told me that the firm deducted from him 6 *d.* every shopping, which was to be paid back to him at Christmas, in a lump sum, the whole of the stoppages; but if he left of his own accord during that time in the busy time, when he could get work elsewhere, he would forfeit this money. This I am told is the invariable practice in two or three firms, some men having to take as much as 10 *l.* at Christmas time, money which is employed by the firm in their own business during that time. In the busy time, the summer, these men could go and get work elsewhere, but they cannot leave, because if they do they would forfeit this money. At Christmas time, when they get their money back, the employers are perfectly safe in giving it back, because the trade is slack, and they cannot get work elsewhere; that, I think, is a system which could be touched by the law.

1276. Why do the men enter into such arrangements?
For the simple reason that they cannot help themselves. The thing begins in January, when trade is slack, and it is carried on till Christmas, when trade is slack again.

1277. Do the knifers understand that it is going to be done?
One man told me that he was asked to sign a paper; he did not know what he was signing at the time. I did not see that paper, but I saw the shop book in which all the stoppages are entered.

1278. Then do you think this can be stopped by legislation?
Legislation does interfere in some instances as regards wages; for instance, the Truck Act distinctly interferes between employers and workmen; it is to protect helpless workmen; and I think in this case it could also be done.

1279. Would you propose that a man should not be allowed, even if he wished, to leave a certain proportion of his wages in the hands of his employer till Christmas time or any other time?
If a man wishes to do so, I do not know how he could very well be prevented; but these men do not wish to do so; these men are bound by the bad condition of wages.

1280. Your theory is that they are compelled to do so?
It is simply taken from them.

1281. Lord *Rothschild.*] Would not you say that the origin of this practice which you have been describing is to prevent an indigent knifer from running away with the raw material?
No, because they have security for that; household security. They will simply write out a security, "I hereby hold myself responsible to the amount of so and so," and they get a friend to sign it.

1282. *Chairman.*] They have to get the security of a householder?
Yes.

1283. Earl of *Onslow.*] Can you tell me what is the most common number of men employed in a sweater's workshop?
I should say, striking an average, it would be about four.

1284. I do not want the average, but the most common number; is three the most common number, or would four be more common?
I think four would be more common.

1285. Therefore if the registration were confined to workshops in which four people were working together, would that be a sufficient limit?
Yes; I think the thing could be made to right itself afterwards by combination and action amongst the men. May I make one further suggestion as to a matter on which I think legislation might fairly take place, and that is that every employer should be compelled to publish a list of the wages he was paying outside the wicket; that is the door where the work is taken in. He may have liberty to reduce the wages he gives if he likes to-morrow; no law can prevent him from reducing the wages if he pleases; but still law could compel him to put outside the wicket what prices he was paying for the different classes of goods, because the invariable practice of these men to-day is this: if they get hold of a weak pliable man they will pay him a halfpenny or a penny, or perhaps three half-pence per pair less than somebody else; they take advantage of the weakness, the poverty, and helplessness of the men; and I think that a certain class of boot should be paid for to every man the same; that is the present practice with the respectable men in the trade.

1286. Are the classes of boots sufficiently known in the market for that to be carried out?
Yes.

1287. Lord *Thring.*] You propose that every morning or evening there should be a placard of such boots?
The list is classified like this: firsts, seconds, thirds, fourths, fifths, sixths, and so on; and the wages, 3 *s.*, 7 *s.*, 8 *s.*, 9 *s.*, or whatever the wages may be. That is a list of prices which should be affixed outside the wicket where the men give their work in, so that every man would know what he had to get.

1288. For

1288. For the day do you mean?
I would say this: if the employer chooses to reduce his wages for any of these classes no legislation can prevent him from doing so, but at all events when he does every one shall know it.

1289. All I asked you was whether you mean every day; that if he changes any day he shall show it?
Yes, exactly; he must make the alteration in full view of all his workmen. At present he is simply taking advantage of the helplessness and weakness of the men. And again I would also emphasise what has already been said in reference to the restriction of the immigration of foreigners. I think some action might be taken in reference to that matter; but as regards any other matters they must, in my opinion, be left entirely, or to a very large extent, to the action of employers and workmen themselves.

1290. Lord *Sandhurst.*] You have lived some time in the East End?
Yes.

1291. From your observation there do you find that there are a large number of agricultural labourers coming from Essex and provincial districts into the East End?
Undoubtedly there are a great number, but they do not come into the boot trade.

1292. You do find a large immigration of those men?
Yes, but they do not come into the boot trade.

1293. Is it an increasing number?
Yes, I should say so.

1294. *Chairman.*] What trade do they generally go into, do you know?
As a rule they get to work on the railways, or down towards the docks, or they work as navvies, and such work as that, and get into warehouses.

1295. Lord *Sandhurst.*] And become unemployed?
Many of them become unemployed, undoubtedly.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. ARNOLD HENRY WHITE, having been re-called; is further Examined, as follows:

1296. *Chairman.*] BEFORE we leave this branch of the inquiry, have you anything further that you would like to say about it?
I should like permission to say that when I was asked "If there were no poor foreigners there would be no sweating system," in the reply that I made I was referring to the boot making trade, not to the whole subject of sweating; because I see that as it is reported my answer would seem to exclude sweating where there are no poor foreigners at all. The evidence I shall give this afternoon has exclusive reference to Christian sweating; sweating where there are no Jews.

1297. Earl of *Onslow.*] In your evidence the other day you said that you proposed to restrict or prohibit the immigration of paupers into this country. Now I should like to have your definition of a pauper immigrant?
My definition of a pauper immigrant is one who is likely to become a public or private charge.

1298. Have you practically adopted the definition of a "pauper" in the American United States?
In the American Act of 1882.

1299. You heard the evidence of two or three witnesses here, that they arrived in this country with a small sum of money in their pockets, and are you aware

aware that that sum of money would be deemed sufficient by the inspector of immigrants in America to justify a man's admission into the United States?

Not only am I not aware of it, but I should respectfully canvass the fact.

1300. Then may I ask this question further: would you call a pauper a person who had no friends to go to?

Provided he had some other qualification of pauperdom. For instance, a man might be rich and have no friends.

1301. But supposing he was poor and had friends?

Then if his friends were able to support him in such a way as to prevent him from becoming a public or private charge, he would not be a pauper.

1302. But how are you going to ascertain when a man lands, whether he will become a charge?

I should ascertain in precisely the same way as it is done at Castle Garden.

1303. In fact all you want is the application of the American Act?

I want the application of the American Act adapted to the peculiarities of the ports of London and Hull.

1304. Then you said something in answer to a question of Lord Thring; Lord Thring asked you whether you would apply your remedy equally to the men of Lancashire, that is to say, the extension of the Factory Acts; I want to ask you this question: Are you aware of the result of the Factory Acts and the prohibition of the hours of female labour and of the labour of young persons, has practically been also to restrict the hours of working of the adults?

I am told that they have had that effect; I do not know it of my own knowledge.

1305. *Chairman.*] You were good enough to give the Committee your general idea about what is known as the sweating system; that applies principally to the boot making trade?

Yes.

1306. I suppose I should be correct in saying that your general ideas would apply also to such other trades as shirt making, tailoring, and cabinet making?

Those general ideas apply throughout.

1307. As regards shirt making and tailoring, are there any peculiarities in those trades that you would like to speak about?

There are some peculiarities that I should like to make a short statement about; and I should propose to divide it into the sweating system as applied to the tailoring trade, the sweating system as applied to the shirt trade, and the sweating system as practised by the Government. In the evidence I give on the tailoring trade I propose to avoid, as far a pssible, any reference to what has been said before by Mr. Burnett or by Mr. Schloss, or by others who have written with authority on the subject; and in order to make what I do say clear to your Lordships, I would propose to repeat the same operation that we had in the boot trade, of exhibiting the processes that are gone through, with the terms that are employed, in order to prevent any misapprehension as to what is meant by the words that are used, in taking what I call Christian sweating, as being sweating practised by Christians on Christians, and not by Jews on Jews, or *vice versâ*, as so much stress has been laid upon the latter. This (*producing a bundle*) is a bundle of goods as they come from the warehouse; they are already cut and trimmed, and everything is found except sewings, that is thread, needle, and so on. The middle man gets 2 *s.* to make them up.

1308. What are they to be made into?

Into suits of trowsers, coat, and vest. This suit (*producing a suit*) is the same materials converted into a marketable condition after the payment of the 2 *s.* The trowsers are pressed off ready for shop at a halfpenny, 6 *d.* a dozen, about 40 pairs a day being possible to the most skilful workers. This (*exhibiting a pair of trowsers*) is the operation that the trowsers have to go through to be turned from this into this (*pointing*) after they are pressed; you see the work and the difference of the garments. This vest (*exhibiting a vest*) is made outright

outright for 5 *d.*, which is the best price. A woman can make four a day. The button-holes are almost invariably sub-let at the rate of 3 *d.* a dozen, excepting the wholesale factories, where they are less; but I am under an undertaking not to mention the price. These vests used to be 8 *d.* in 1881, and I produced one at the Home Office in November, where evidence was forthcoming to the effect that 9 *d.* used to be the price.

1309. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] What do you mean by saying "outright;" what is the state before the 5 *d.* is paid?

That is the state before the 5 *d.* is paid (*showing some pieces*).

1310. It is made into this state for 5 *d.*?

Yes.

1311. Lord *Thring.*] Is that done by machine?

It is done by machine mostly. The machining is machining, but the lining and basting and button-holing and felling are done by hand. This coat (*producing a coat*) is made for 7½ *d.*; a woman can make four a day by working about 15 hours, 2 *s.* 6 *d.* Out of this is paid 3 *d.* for button-holes, 4 *d.* for trimmings. "Trimmings" is the synonym of "grindery" in the boot trade, if your Lordships will remember "grindery;" "trimmings" is the word used in the tailoring trade. "Trimmings" include soap, fire, iron. One day a week is lost in the shopping. A half-day is necessary for domestic work, for cleaning up the house, washing the children, and so on, leaving four and a half working days, bringing in an average of about 8 *s.* 6 *d.* for a week's wages. This (*exhibiting a pair of trowsers*) is the first state of the trowsers after they are felled. These (*pointing*) are the linings; and there is a remarkable thing about these linings I will call your attention to. You see the sort of angle, or gusset-shaped mark on these linings; that arises from what is called skimped cutting; that is to say, through anxiety to save material in the cutting, this piece (*pointing to a piece*) has been snipped out and the lining passed on to the poor woman who has to work at these goods with this defect. She has, in additon to the labour that has been pointed out to you, to insert this piece as well (*showing a piece*), and that is not at all an uncommon thing to have to be done. This (*pointing to a pair of trowsers*) is the second stage of the same trowsers after the finishing work has been done, for which 2 *d.* has been paid. The work that has to be done for this 2 *d* is to put in the linings, to put on the band, to knotch the fly, that is to cut the fly of the trowsers into this corrugated shape, to put on 11 buttons, to make five button-holes, to soap the bottoms, to turn them up, to tack the pockets, and to sew on the ticket, the trade mark of the manufacturer who gives them out.

1312. *Chairman.*] What do you mean by soaping?

It is to make them hang well on the legs. You see those trowsers (*pointing*) completed and soaped, and unpressed; you see it is a very different article from that after it is soaped and pressed, for which I said a halfpenny was paid for turning it from this stage into that. The payments for adult clothing are bad enough, but children's clothing, vestings and trowserings, seem to command a lower rate of wage even than what is called diagonal work. This (*exhibiting a suit*) is a knickerbocker suit, called in the trade a knicker suit. In this stage (*pointing to a bundle*) a woman gets 4¾ *d.* for making it up into a state which you will see directly, two garments; there is no vest in a knicker suit. The middle man gets 7 *d.*, by which he makes a profit of 2¼ *d.* on each suit. Your Lordships see the condition it is in without lining. Here (*pointing*) is the lining, there is the basting (*pointing*), here is the knicker and the vest made up (*producing them*). This is made up from the rough, made up from the pieces. Here is the suit finished, with the linings and the pockets and the buttons complete. The woman gets 9 *d.* for that, and the middle man 1 *s.*, making a profit of 3 *d.* to the middle man. The work involved on the jacket is five pleats, which take much labour; these are pleats on the front (*pointing them out*), two pockets, nine buttons, five buttonholes, and the lining and basting; and on the knickers two pockets, 17 buttons, four buttonholes, band, lining, and the suit has to be pressed and finished and soaped in the same manner as was described in the previous suit. This (*producing another suit*) is a different colour, but it

is exactly the same suit as that, completed ready for shop. A suit is made complete for 9*d.*, and the sweater gets 1*s.* 3*d.* So great has the fall of wages been since 1879, that this very suit, for which the sweater now only gets 1*s.* 3*d.*, but on which he makes 6*d.*, nine years ago, just before this pauper immigration began, he got 3*s.* 6*d.* for. This suit (*producing another suit*), of which I only show the jacket, is done complete (it is one of the worst cases) for 4½ *d.*, the sweater getting 7*d.*, leaving a profit of 2½ *d.* to the sweater. This suit (*exhibiting another suit*), of which the jacket only is shown, not the knickers, is made complete for 10 *d.*, the sweater gets 1 *s.* 2 *d.* The pleats on this suit require a considerable amount of hand-work, every pleat has to be basted and placed open before it is inserted; these are the pleats for that garment (*pointing them out*). These (*producing a bundle*) are export trowsers, made, to be precise, to send to Adelaide, the price for making them up being 4½*d.*, and the price to the sweater being 7 *d.*

1313. When you use the term "sweater" you mean the same thing as in the previous evidence?

Yes, the middle man. If your Lordships will smell these trowsers, to give them a glossy appearance, I may say that urine is used, and the smell of the workshops in which it is done is, as you can imagine, bad, abominable. Just finishing the clothing trade by taking three specimens of the shirts; the machinery of a dozen of these shirts (*pointing*) is 7½*d.*, the finishing a dozen is 2½ *d.*, and the sweater gets 1*s.* 9*d.*; that is to say, it costs him 10*d.*, and he gets 1*s.* 9*d.*, out of which he has to pay for the cutting. They are sold wholesale at 10*s.* 6*d.* a dozen.

1314. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] What does the cutting cost?

About 1*d.* a dozen, rather less.

1315. *Chairman.*] What is that, flannel?

Flannel; it is called flannelette; it is a mixture with cotton in it. This (*producing a piece*) is the shirt in its first state as it is given out to a woman. This (*pointing*) is an Oxford shirt; the machining, turning it from that state into this (*pointing*), is 1 *s.* 6 *d.* a dozen; the finishing, 6 *d.* a dozen, a halfpenny each; the cutting out about 1½ *d.*, and the sweater gets 4 *s.* Now this (*producing a shirt*) is a shirt that is worn in the west end; it is a bespoke shirt, made to measure, with cuffs, with two link-holes in the cuffs, hand sewn link-holes; it has 12 button-holes, and it is done all complete for 1 *s.* each. The sweater gets 2 *s.*, leaving a profit of a shilling to him. This shirt is sold in the shops for about 7 *s.* 6 *d.*

1316. Earl of *Limerick.*] Did I understand rightly, that you said that there were 12 button-holes in that shirt?

Twelve button-holes. There are two button-holes for links, and one for the mother-of-pearl button; that makes five on each cuff, and then there are three in front. With the exception of the shirt, all the garments that have been exhibited are slop clothing, and the sweating system is, I believe, absolutely restricted to that department of the clothiery trade which deals with slop clothing, Government clothing, or what may be called contract work, such as military, railway, and police uniforms. In the tender given out by Government, there is a clause which provides that the contractor shall make up all the garments at his own factory, and it goes on to say, "No work whatever must be done at the homes of the workpeople. Any infringement of this condition, if proved to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State, shall render the contractor liable to a penalty not exceeding 100 *l.*, which may be deducted in the manner laid down in Clause 6, conditions of contract." No doubt your Lordships will ask the subsequent witnesses who are called from the ranks of the manufacturers, how many times in their knowledge that 100 *l.* has been exacted, and to what extent the Government (using that term for the employer) have seen to the observance of that condition that the work should be done by the contractors in their workshops, and should not be given out. It will appear in evidence, that it is habitually the practice to give out these contracts into sub-contracts, and sometimes into sub-sub-contracts, though that is very rare, and it

it is in that class of work that the sweating occurs, and so far as the Government is responsible for making that form of tender, so far it is responsible for not seeing that the provisions are carried out, and it seems to be therefore accessory to the sweating system. The manufactures say that they do it because they all do it. The chief points in the system in the clothing trade are as follows: A merchant or contractor, exactly as in the boot trade, if he has no factory of his own, gives out to the tailors who apply to him the garments he has to make.

1317. *Chairman.*] What do you mean by the term "tailor"?

The middleman, the man between the manufacturer and the worker, the sweater. The first receiver of the garments usually has his own workshop in which he makes some portion of the work, but the greater part is given out again. I do not want to use any names here, but a contract has been put into my hands just now which reads in a very remarkable manner, having reference to the clause in the contract I have read: "I, the undersigned, hereby agree in the event of army, police, or railway clothing being entrusted to [ ], residing at [ ], for the purpose of being made up, to hold myself responsible to Messrs." (So-and-So), "for the safety of the garments;" indicating, therefore, that it is so habitual a practice to give out the goods that they have a form of indemnity printed.

1318. Earl of *Onslow.*] Do you hand the tender in?

Yes.

1319. And do you hand in that document which you have just read?

I will hand it to the Chairman. I will hand it in as evidence, but I am anxious for the names to be suppressed, but I have given you everything except the names.

1320. *Chairman.*] It is a printed form?

To the amount of 10 *l.*, with a sixpenny stamp on it. I may say that the information I am giving now is given me by manufacturers doing some of the largest work in the country, and no doubt it is perfectly accurate. Although the sweater generally has a workshop, it sometimes happens that he has no workshop and no machines, and contributes nothing to the production of the garments, except the exaction of labour from the workers, and he stands in just the same position to the clothing trade, whether shirts or overgarments, as the knifer who does not knife does to the bootmaking trade. The first receiver of a garment is known, as Mr. Burnett points out, as the labour contractor, and the man who receives it from him as the sweater; but the distinction is I consider unnecessary, as both are sweaters under the definition given. The principle upon which the work is carried out is very much like that in the boot trade, great sub-division of labour; each part of the garment being done by a separate person. A sweater will employ a fixer if he does not do that work himself; a machinist, a baster ——

1321. Will you explain the terms as you go on; what does a "fixer" mean?

The fixing is the first process when the cloth is cut out; the two sides of a pair of trowsers are tacked on to one another, and that process is called "fixing." "Machinists," your Lordships know, are those who sew with a sewing machine. The "baster" is the man who does the inside of the coat with tacking stitches. And he would also employ a plain sewing hand for buttons, a button-hole maker; and a presser, whose work is done by a pressing iron; it used to be called a "goose." But even into the tailoring "goose" trade machinery is coming, and the pressing, which formerly was universally done by hand, and which is a very laborious work and the most highly paid, is now in the manufactories done by a machine where the weight of the press is automatically taken off the hand of the worker by a balance, and the heat of the press, instead of being repeatedly applied to a coke fire, is maintained at its proper temperature by the application of gas with a flexible tube. I think those are the only technical terms which are employed to which I need call your attention. Now, all these persons named are paid by the day with the exception of the button-

holers, who are universally paid by the piece. These latter, the button-holers and the sewing hands, are generally women, the others are always men; I have met with one woman presser, but I was told that it was quite the exception. For a tailor to make clothing at a low price, and at the same time earn a livelihood, he has necessarily to work his people very long hours, and I need not repeat that portion of the evidence, because the cloth and the other materials required for the making of the garments stand in precisely the same relation to tailoring as the various materials described to your Lordships did in the case of boot-making; and it is on the earnings, and the earnings alone, that either more profit can be made or the contract be carried out more cheaply. At the same time, with regard to the length of hours, although it extends from 14 to 15, 16 and 18 hours, and occasionally at a stretch to even more, I cannot say that, from the investigations I have made, the hours are so long as they were in the boot trade; and I would direct your Lordships' attention, if I may, to the fact that there are fewer people, comparatively, employed coming in as immigrants in the tailoring trade than there were in the boot trade, and whether that does not suggest some intimate connection between the evils of the one and the fact of the other. Now the evils of the sweating system in the clothing trade chiefly divide themselves into two classes; the evils as regards the workpeople, and the evils as regards the place in which they work. The hours they work are excessive; 14 hours seem to be considered a day; but there is one feature in the tailoring trade which appears to have no analogy in the other trade that your Lordships have considered, and that is the unfairness with which a half-day or a quarter-day is construed by the masters, by the sweaters. It is a usual thing for seven-and-a-half, eight, and nine hours to be regarded as a half-day, and for four, five, and sometimes six hours to be regarded as a quarter-day, and the greatest injustice is inflicted on the workers in that respect. I have here the evidence of a girl who will be called, a Hungarian, only 18 years old, earning 8 *s.* a week at the highest, sometimes only 3 *s.*; she works from seven in the morning till half-past eight at night; if she goes in on Friday, she works from 6 a.m. till 5 p.m., 11 hours, when she gets paid for half-a-day. She is a girl who came over like the rest of the greeneers (only your Lordships have not seen any of the women who have come over yet), lives with a woman whose husband sleeps upstairs, and she pays 1 *s.* a week. I touch on this, because only a suggestion will be required to indicate the source whence such a livelihood must be supplemented. She, in common with six other witnesses whom I took absolutely at haphazard within the last few days, testifies to the fact that although seven men and three women are employed in one workshop, there is only one sanitary convenience; and that I think you will find almost universal.

1322. Is that the case in the other trades, do you think?

I think so, almost universal. I have one case of 50 people in a house only having one sanitary convenience. Now, in addition to the long hours, and the extreme unfairness of the reckoning as half-a-day what should be really a day's work, their grievance is the great irregularity of their meals. If a man avails himself (or a woman) of the full hour for dinner, he runs a great risk of being discharged; and I have several instances which I will not go into (the persons can be called afterwards), of the women being refused the regulation half-hour for tea. The tea is put down by their side, and they take the tea at the work-table, just stopping for two minutes to drink it; and if they insist on having their rights under the Act, they have the freedom to be discharged from their employment. The superintendence on the part of the employer is often very harsh and severe; no latitude is allowed, and the utmost effort of which they are capable is enacted. Now, as to the wages of the workpeople, many of them are paid fairly well, receiving as much as 7*s.*, 8*s.*, and 9*s.* a day, but these are very few.

1323. Do you mean men?

Yes; the majority of the men receive, when they are at work, from 4*s.* down to 1*s.* 6*d.* a day, but for which they have to work on occasions 16 and 17 hours. The women will get from 1*s.* 6*d.* to 3*s.* a day, but this latter would be very exceptional;

exceptional; the general tendency is, and has been for the last eight years, to lower the wages and increase the number of hours which they work. In the payment of the wages the sweaters are often very arbitrary, the men having to submit to the deduction of half a day when they have only lost a few hours; and in cases where they work all night, and from 8 a.m. until 12 p.m. through the week, and have been promised extra money, when paid they only get 1*s.* 6*d.* or 2*s.* Now with regard to the evils affecting the workshops, it seems to be the ambition of every tailor learning his work to be a master as soon as he can. When he has saved a little money he rents a room, and hires a machine and starts a sweating establishment. The size of the room is almost invariably inadequate to the number of persons employed in it; and in the summer time, especially the heat from the coke fire, the stuffiness of the atmosphere, and the exhalation from bodies that are not often washed, and not infrequently the smells from the wholly inadequate sanitary accommodation, are most revolting. The houses in which the work is carried on are very often in a most deplorable condition, the stench of filth being so great that it must be dangerous to health, and the sanitary inspector, as I saw last week, is a farce. The "greeners" coming into the tailoring trade are not so many in relation to the size of the trade as in the case of the boot trade. It is quite impossible for the factory inspectors to cope with this evil under the present system of factory regulation; and I will repeat that the staff of inspectors is too small, and as the sweaters are very numerous it is beyond the power of the factory inspectors to discover them. I have been round at 12 o'clock at night both alone, many times, and recently with a Home Office official, and armed with his certificate we entered several establishments. We found in some cases women employed at 12 o'clock at night, which of course was against the Act, but in the majority of cases they were not found. What took place was this: I went into 13 sweating dens that night, and by standing on the opposite side of the road to the sweating den, when it happened to be a front room, and waiting while the inspector sought admittance, I could see girls getting up from their work and running away, and by the time we go upstairs there were no women in the place. I only mention that to show the fact that the Act is evaded and the facility with which it is evaded.

1324. Earl of *Onslow.*] We have never had clearly put upon the notes what are the powers of the inspectors under the Factory Act; can you describe them?

I have the Act here.

1325. Will you just read what the powers are?

They are rather long.

1326. I will read you an extract out of the Chief Inspector of Factories' Report, and I will ask you whether you agree with it?

I think a few sections will do. Part I., Section 3: "A factory and a workshop shall be kept in a cleanly state and free from effluvia arising from any drain, privy, or other nuisance. A factory or workshop shall not be so overcrowded while work is carried on therein as to be injurious to the health of the persons employed therein, and shall be ventilated in such a manner as to render harmless, so far as is practicable, all the gases, vapours, dust, or other impurities generated in the course of the manufacturing process or handicraft carried on therein that may be injurious to health. A factory or workshop in which there is a contravention of this section shall be deemed not to be kept in conformity with this Act." Then Section 4 is, "Where it appears to an inspector under this Act that any act, neglect, or default in relation to any drain, water closet, earth closet, privy, ash pit, water supply, nuisance, or other matter in a factory or workshop is punishable or remediable under the law relating to public health, but not under this Act, that inspector shall give notice in writing of such act, neglect, or default to the sanitary authority in whose district the factory or workshop is situate, and it shall be the duty of the sanitary authority to make such inquiry into the subject of the notice, and take such action thereon, as to that authority may seem proper for the purpose of enforcing the law."

1327. Now would you read from the interpretation clause what a "factory" is?

I do not think there is any definition in it; it is a consolidating Act.

1328. Do you agree with what is stated in the report I hold in my hand: that the above regulations apply to all workshops in which any child or young person is employed, unless such child or young person is a member of the family of the occupier of the dwelling-house in which such occupation is carried on; do those regulations which you have just read apply to all workshops in which any child or young person is employed, unless such child or young person is a member of the family of the occupier of the dwelling-house?

I understand that that is so.

1329. Is it not the fact that the Factory and Workshop Act applies only to workshops in which young persons and children are employed and in which women and men are not employed together, but not to workshops in which men are employed alone or in which women are employed alone?

That is so; the three definitions in Table A. being "for women and young persons," "for children," and "for women, young persons, and children." For the protection of the workers there are a series of about 20 abstracts, which are published by Messrs. Waterlow and procurable from them by the sweaters at the instance of the factory inspector. This is one of the abstracts (*producing it*), and I submit to your Lordships whether, where everybody in the room is a foreigner, and most unlikely to be able to read a word of English, any real protection is afforded to the workers by the highly technical and skilled *précis* of that rather voluminous Act. What takes place is this: This document is stowed away in a drawer, where it gets grimy with age. In one of those workshops that the inspector happens to visit he says, "Where is your abstract?" "Oh," is the man's reply, "I have got it here;" and he goes to the drawer and pulls out a mouldy document, and puts it up. The next time the room is whitewashed he puts it away again. I point out the absolute uselessness of that provision as regards the workers whom the abstract is intended to protect. I was going to suggest that for the efficient protection of the workers, of the women and children so far as they are protected under this Act, this English abstract should be replaced, so far as foreign workers are concerned, by a concise and clear statement in the vernacular, printed in Hebrew. If it be said that you could not have a separate abstract for every trade, I should say that for the larger trades, for tailoring and bootmaking, and so on, it would be worth while to have such an abstract as that; at all events, it would place the workers in possession of knowledge as to their rights, of which they are now ignorant, and in regard to which they, at all events, are not protected, as, for example, that half-hour for tea, which is a very important provision. Now, with reference to the questions on this subject that were put to me last week, as to the extreme difficulty of improving the arrangements now subsisting between the parochial or sanitary authority and the imperial or inspectorial authority, I submit that if a return were called for from each parish in London, stating the number of factories, workshops, and dwelling-houses used as factories in each parish, it would not be a difficult matter to form districts to be presided over by a chief inspector with as many subordinates as might be required, with a combination under his office of sanitary and inspecting duties; that each chief inspector of such a district should have absolute control over all the sanitary arrangements of the factories in his charge, without the necessity of giving notice to the sanitary authority, which is now the case, and which leads to so very little action being taken. Then I submit that there ought to be distinct statements in an amended Factory Act on the subject of overcrowding, what it is constitutes overcrowding. You have provided under prison regulations and workhouse regulations the number of cubic feet of air that are required for consumption by each individual; if it be worth the while of the State at all to interfere with the means under which commerce is carried on, surely it must be more important to insure the healthy conditions of workers than to insure the healthy conditions under which convicts are kept. A second detail in which a distinct statement ought to appear in the Factory Act should be in regard to the

the sanitary arrangements for men and women, with a severe penalty for infringement. The indecency I believe a fruitful source of immorality arising from this cause, at all events killing in young people any sense of delicacy, is a very great evil; and if it be said that that might raise rents, I think it will have the effect of filling up the buildings which are built in a sanitary and decent style, which are now half-empty; because the small houses lend themselves much more to the sweating system than the large buildings do. I know several instances, at all events, in the Western Central district of London where you have overcrowding in the little houses, and the large buildings, artizans' dwellings, half empty. Now, if this Abstract which I propose were placed on the wall of every factory and workshop before the opening of any workshop notice should be given in writing to the Inspector, and on being satisfied that the building or room conforms to the provisions of the Act he should affix his seal to the Abstract, and thus register the workshop. At present it is a matter very much of will whether these documents are or are not affixed, at all events, they do not secure the object they are intended to attain. I can only repeat very briefly that I do strongly consider that a substantial registration fee should be exacted, because, if there is any point upon which you can put your finger in this sweating system that is bad, it is the existence of a class of men who contribute neither capital, labour, nor speculation, these middle-men sweaters; and to drive them out of existence would seem to me to be a public boon, Then with regard to the restriction of adult male labour, if I may venture again to refer to Lord Thring's questions last week, I cannot, on fullest consideration, see any essential difference between the helplessness of men who are helpless, and the helplessness of women and children who are helpless. The question is not as to their sex, but as to the effect on the community as a whole, which I understand to be the object of all legislation. If it can be shown that men are leading such lives under an Act of Parliament, that the next generation is being weakened and tainted, it seems to me, notwithstanding the Lancashire operative, a very highly desirable object of legislation that those men who are helpless in any particular trade should have the same protection extended to them as is extended in the case of women and children. Then, certain holidays are granted, the Bank holidays, and so on. Every occupier of a factory or workshop ought to keep a register of the manner in which these holidays are observed, and to transmit the note of the holidays to the Chief Inspector, as stated. And, in the last place, if any part of any building be used for the purpose of a workshop or factory, unless the Inspector has the right of entering and examining the whole building, you might as well have no legislation or Factory Act, because the number of cases in which the women are hidden in the kitchen or in the attic during the visit of the Inspector is so numerous, and the practice so habitual, that it is impossible to resist the conclusion that the Act is practically a dead letter at the present time. Now I am so anxious that another witness should appear to-day that I will go directly to another branch of the subject, the same thing, but another branch. In the course of my investigations I have received a great many letters and communications from people who say they are being sweated, but in the very large majority of instances I find that the sweating is to a great extent a matter of imagination. I received a letter from a man at Chatham who, being in the employ of the Government, required that I should not reveal his name. With your Lordships' permission I will read this letter and put it in.

1330. *Chairman.*] What is he employed at?

That is just what I do not want to say, because he would lose his place at once. It is on the subject of the execution of Government clothing at low rates of wages. "The sweating system here is worse than it is at the East-end of London, and if exposure can do good I hope it will be done. This class of work is given out in small lots to women, soldiers' wives and pensioners' wives. The control of the work is entrusted to the master tailor in the Marine Barracks, and he gives the work out as it is wanted to these poor women; their husbands' pay (many of whom are private soldiers) amounts to 7*s.* per week, so the wives must do something. They very often have to wait at the

barracks hours before they get their work, causing much loss of time. The following articles are made at starvation prices, and they only form a portion. Navy uniform shirts strongly sewn, taking four hours to make, 5*d.* each; the contractor or middleman finds all material. Three flannel shirts like long coats for hospital use a woman gets 1 *s.* 1½ *d.*; they will take a day to make, hard work, 12 or 13 hours a day. Long flannel coats down to the toes, having 16 buttons and holes to be worked, they get 1 *s.* 4*d.* for, each closely inspected and, if any fault found, returned. One dozen of navy sheets, these are about three yards long and one and half wide. These are heavy linen and very hard to work, hand sewn, for which they get 9 *d.* per dozen. Bed ticks six feet long, three feet wide, stitched both sides, 1 *s.* 3 *d.* per dozen. Pillow slips 9 *d.* per dozen. Marines' shirts 4½ *d.* each. Trousers 7 *d.* each. White duck tunics 7 *d.* each. Towels one yard long three-quarters wide 4½ *d.* per dozen."

1331. *Earl of Aberdeen.*] That work is given to contractors, I suppose?
I am going to explain the system at Chatham.

1332. *Chairman.*] You have no knowledge, I suppose, of whether that is true or not?
I have; I have been down to Chatham and investigated it myself, and all the evidence I give is personal and not second-hand.

1333. You propose to substantiate that?
I propose to proceed to substantiate what is stated. To verify these statements I asked a friend to go, and accordingly two visits were made and the statements were verified by my friend. I thought it was sufficiently important to go down and I went down, and I also verified the statements. I also went to the Admiralty and I obtained credentials, and I presented these credentials to the Commandant of the Marine Barracks at Chatham with the result that I saw the master tailor and I produced certain documents that I will explain. Now the clothing system at Chatham is as follows: There are three sets of barracks, the Line Barracks, the Engineer Barracks, and the Marine Barracks. The clothing for the Engineer Barracks is provided by the Clothing Factory at Pimlico; the clothing for the Line Barracks is administered by a committee of officers' wives, ladies who undertake the work, and the system appears to work admirably; there are no complaints of unfairness, or of under-pay. But with regard to the system under the master tailor at the Marine Barracks it is not so satisfactory. At the Chatham Marine Barracks the work is given out under the supervision of the master tailor. The women receive their money weekly, but in receipting their pay-sheets they sign a form where the amounts are not filled in. I had this first from the women, second, from the master tailor in the presence of the Commandant, and I, therefore, take it to be a fact. Now, the effect of that is this: the whole of the work that is done under the supervision of the master tailor at Chatham by these women is done by the women in ignorance of what the proper rates of pay (the Government Statement it is called) are. I have a copy of that Statement which I will hand in afterwards.

1334. Does that Statement you propose to hand in give the rate of wages.
Yes; it does. Now, in order to make it clear what the allegation is, in order to have further a much more rigid inquiry I asked some questions of the master tailor. The only fact that I have stated at present is the one that I have committed myself to, namely, that the women sign for their money without having the total amount to be paid to each worker inserted on the sheet before they sign; in other words the women work at these low rates that I have read out in ignorance of what money is paid by the Admiralty for their work. Now, it is not surprising when that is the case, that there is an allegation of difference between the amount that they receive and the amount that they are said to be paid; and in the presence of the Commandant I asked the master tailor the following questions: "What do you pay for the sailor blue shirts?" He pays 6½ *d.* for the old pattern, 10 *d.* for the new pattern, 1½ *d.* for machining. The women say that they only receive 4½ *d.*

1335. Lord *Monkswell.*] They do not receive 4 *d.* for both alike, the old and new pattern as well, do they?

The

The fact is that they are only doing the old pattern. For "grey woollen shirts, serges for the Navy," he says, and the Statement says, that he pays 1 *s.* 3 *d.*; the women say that they get 1 *s.* 2 *d.* For pillow slips the women say that they get 11 *d.*; he says, and the Statement says, that 1 *s.* is paid; again, a difference of 1 *d.* For pillow cases, without tapes, 10 *d.*, say the women; he says 11 *d.*; again a difference of 1 *d.* I do not know that I need go through the whole thing; all I want to point out is that the women are working in ignorance of the prices paid, and as the witness, Mr. Hoffmann, suggested in the boot trade the price to be paid should be put up, I think it would ameliorate the lot of a number of poor women working at Chatham, if a public Statement were put up as to the prices allowed for the making of these different garments.

1336. Lord *Thring.* The receipts are in dummy; there are no sums entered at all?

There are no sums entered while the women sign, but here are some of the original receipts (*producing them*).

1337. I understand you to say that the women sign receipts in which there is no statement of the money for which they sign?

That is so; but it is filled up between the signature by the woman and the signature by the Commandant.

1338. Do you allege who fills up the price?

I do, distinctly. I say it is filled up or caused to be filled up by the master tailor. It is filled up before the Commandant signs it, or else it would not be signed. The master tailor admitted to me in the presence of the Commandant that the amount was not on the sheet when the woman signs.

1339. These sheets are put in, are they?

I shall have to return them to Chatham; there is no object in putting them in; I make the statement and take the responsibility of it. That is merely a specimen to show what it is. I am so anxious that the time should come for other witnesses behind to be called that the only remark I want to make now in addition is, that in the sweating in the far East-end, where the Jews are not in question, among the women, one of the chief causes, perhaps the chief cause, there, is not so much the introduction of machinery or the immigration of paupers to that particular spot, though the trade is affected no doubt by those things, but the fact that there is a growing practice in the East-end of London for wives to support their husbands. The husbands of the women who made these shirts, and many of those garments, are dock labourers; and a more precarious and uncertain and nomadic form of labour than that does not exist in London. The consequence is that the desire on the part of the women to increase the earnings of the family is so intense that they compete with one another to a point that drives wages lower even than they are among the foreigners further west, in Whitechapel. And little girls often help them. I have come across cases of girls of 13, and even older, still in the lowest standard, and not having passed the age when they are supposed to go to school. And this increasing number of unemployed men is, as I say, creating a class of people who are supported by women, men who are idle by necessity or by choice, very often by necessity. Another reason for the extreme lowness of rates in that part of the East-end is the preference that girls have for freedom in the evening, and therefore they would work at very much lower wages where they have such freedom on Sundays than go to service; and the number of them is so increasing with the magnetism of London that the tendency of prices to go down is accelerated by that fact. Of course that lends itself to the sweating system to a very large extent. I have an immense amount of evidence which I have collected, but I will not trouble your Lordships with it, because it can easily be produced by other witnesses. For instance, as an example of the sweater's profits in the shirt trade, he gets out the cloth and buttons to make up the shirts at 1 *s.* 6 *d.* a dozen, and from this he gives $7\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* dozen to a machinist, and $2\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* a dozen to a finisher; say his cutter costs $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* a dozen, his porterage perhaps $\frac{1}{4}$ *d.* a dozen, tying them in dozens $\frac{1}{4}$ *d.* a dozen, his time $\frac{1}{4}$ *d.* a dozen, he makes $6\frac{1}{4}$ *d.* a dozen clear profit. Machinists can do two dozen a day, and finishers about two and a-half dozen. The work is very

trying to the eyes of the finishers, and many of them suffer from weak sight through sitting at the lamp; I have many cases of that weak sight, which I could produce here. But the actual sweater in the far East is a well-to-do man, not in the low position of the poor knifer.

1340. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] Have you had under your notice what is known as the learner system?
In the shirt or in the clothing trade, do you mean? It occurs in both.

1341. In those cases where women only are emyloyed?
Yes; I have come across it.

1342. *Chairman.*] I do not propose to ask you any questions to-day as to the system under which Government contracts are given out, and I presume that the Committee can get details better from other witnesses than they can from you?
Yes.

1343. But there are just one or two things I should like to ask you. You spoke about the far East-end of London; what do you mean by the "far East-end?"
In ordinary parlance the East-end generally means Whitechapel and so on, and Spitalfields, but the "far East-end" I call Mile-End, and Bow and Bethnal Green.

1344. Is it inhabited by English only?
There are a good many Jews there, but it is inhabited by this class of workers, almost all Christians.

1345. The evils appear to be just the same as they are amongst the workers in the boot trade?
I do not think their lives are so sordid.

1346. Do you think that the lives of the people engaged in the tailoring trade are not so sordid as those of the people engaged in the boot trade?
I think not.

1347. But the sanitary evils, are they the same?
The sanitary evils are the same in the tailoring trade; but the people who live further east are some of them very respectable, clean people, who would be clean anywhere; you cannot speak of them as a class as you can of the immigrants.

1348. The unsanitary condition of the sweating dens appears to be the same whether in the tailoring trade or the bootmaking trade?
Yes.

1349. The general evils of the system are the same in both trades, and practically you propose the same description of remedies?
I should.

1350. You gave us the selling price of a shirt, but you did not give us the selling price of any of the suits of clothes?
That will be done by the next witness.

1351. I understand that in the tailoring trade two middlemen intervene between the manufacturer or shopkeeper and the worker; that is to say, that one man takes the goods out from the shop, and does not follow them himself, but sub-lets them to another men?
That is so sometimes; but the tendency of that sub-middleman is to disappear, the competition is so much greater.

1352. Are all the different stages employed in making up a suit of clothes all conducted in one and the same shop room?
No.

1353. They go about from hand to hand?
They go about from hand to hand.

1354. Do

1354. Do they go back to the shop in the same way as in the case of the boot trade?

They go back to the shop in very much the same way. And with regard to their going about from hand to hand, I omitted to say that the poor people who have no bed-clothes use them as coverings, and sometimes when there is scarlet fever in a house, it is a very excellent method of spreading a contagious disease.

1355. Women are largely employed in this trade?

Largely.

1356. Do they work in the same rooms and shops as the men?

In the same shops as the men.

1357. I mean, as a general rule, do you find men and women working together?

Yes.

1358. And the women working the same hours as the men?

No; the women, of course, are restricted by the Factory Act. Sometimes when they are not working according to the provisions of the Factory Act, that is, by the evasion of the sweater, but they do work long hours.

1359. I want to know whether, as far as your experience goes, you think that, as a rule, the women do work over hours.

I should not say that they work over hours as a rule, if you mean almost every woman; but working over hours is a common practice; and certainly they work over hours if the half hour for tea, and the hour for dinner not bein allowed, be taken into consideration.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

The REVEREND JAMES MUNRO, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

1360. *Chairman.*] ARE you a Congregational Minister?

Yes.

1361. And where is the place of worship of which you are minister?

In Bethnal Green. I may say that for a number of years Mr. Arnold White and I have been working together in conjunction at some of the various problems that arise in the East-end. For some years we spent one night each week in the streets of London during the winter, and we gathered the evidence that was put in "The Bitter Cry," which brought me in contact with those people. Over two years ago, to try and make some experiment to see if we could relieve the condition of the sweatee, we opened a small factory in the East-end of London, and from that time till now I have been in almost daily contact with those poor people.

1362. And you are, therefore, well acquainted with the subject of the sweating system?

I am, therefore, well acquainted with the whole condition of the sweating system in the clothing trade, and also in the shirt trade.

1363. You have heard the evidence which Mr. Arnold White has given; do you generally agree with what he has put before the Committee?

With everything that he has said I agree most thoroughly.

1364. Perhaps you would like to add to his evidence?

I should like to say that the profits that were made by the sweaters some years ago, five year ago, were greater than they are now; prices have gone down nearly 25 per cent. in five years. It is the fact that every year the prices are being lowered. That comes from two causes. One is the keen competition of the country houses with the City clothing houses. I have been in the ware-

houses myself, and seen travellers come back from the country, stating that they could not get orders because certain houses in the country, which they named, had sold goods at a lower rate. The first thing that was said then by the manager to his foreman was, "You must reduce the price of making." That is one course of reducing the price; the other is the keen competition amongst the sweaters. It is a fact that while one man is offered work at a certain price, and he says, "No, I cannot do it," another man is standing, perhaps, behind him, and when he goes out he offers to take it. Then the third cause is that which Mr. Arnold White has referred to; the people themselves compete with one another, and that competition arises from this cause: that they do not sell their labour for what it is worth. A man may be out of work, and the woman feels that if she can make 4 *s.* or 5 *s.* a week it will help her to pay the rent, or get bread for her family. If she can get work for 10, 12, or 14 hours a day to bring her in 4 *s.* or 5 *s.* a week she is perfectly satisfied. These women are constantly coming into the market, because in the one-room life of the East-end of London a woman living in the back room goes in to the woman living in the front room; then she begins to do do a little work, say, in the finishing of trousers; and by-and-bye she acquires the knowledge to do them herself. Then she will go to the sweater and offer to take the work out sometimes at a farthing and other times, I have known, at a halfpenny less. Thus it is that the prices become reduced by the keen competition of the workers themselves. The number of women I have calculated employed in the seamstress work of London is 25,000, basing my calculation on the Returns of 1881, and allowing for the same ratio of increase as that between 1871 and 1881.

1365. Is that the number of the women all over London?

Yes.

1366. It was in order to get rid, I suppose, of these evils produced by competition you started a factory?

Yes; perhaps if you would permit me I might speak of the effects of the factory a little later.

1367. The Committee would be glad to hear from you a history of your factory?

I should just like now to speak of the homes of those women, because the majority of the women are home-workers, for this reason: that the sweater, as I understand him, is the distributor, and the distributor has no factory of his own. I should not like the Committee to understand from that that there are no sweaters with factories; there are many, but the sweater is a distributor with no factory of his own who gives out the work to the people in their own homes. He has great facilities for doing this, because the sewing machine companies let out many sewing machines to the poor people in the East-end of London, and consequently they are in a position to take the work and do it in their own homes. The consequence is that most of this low-class work is made in the homes of the people themselves. I have seen the garments on the shoulders of the poor while they are working at their machines and finishing on their own shoulders to keep them warm. I have seen the children lying asleep covered with them at night, and a child lying ill with the measles, with garments from one of the sweaters as its covering. The home-life of those women, working and sleeping and living in the one room, renders it impossible for them to take any exercise excepting when they go and come with the work to and from the shop. The houses are as cleanly as it is possible for those women to keep them, but doing all their work, and living and sleeping in one room, it is not possible to keep them in such a cleanly condition as they would do if they had another room to work in. Consequently, especially in the hot season, vermin is very often found in the cloth; and I have seen the work taken into several of the large houses, and you will invariably notice a taker-in of the work taking his shears and killing the worst form of vermin creeping up the garments. Now the price of making trousers range as low as from 4½ *d.* per pair, men's trousers; and in making those men's trousers they have not only to make the trousers right out, with two pockets, but to put a hip pocket in them also. If I might be permitted I should like to show you

a coat

a coat which was made by a woman for 7½ *d.* This coat (*putting on the coat*) has been made by a woman for 7½ *d.*, and which, as you see, almost fits me. Then waistcoats that would fit me are made for from 4½ *d.* upwards. Juvenile clothing, that is two garments, a little jacket embroidered with braid and little knickers with two pockets in them, are made from 6 *d.*; that 6 *d.* is given at the warehouse, but they are made by the poor people themselves for 4 *d.*

1368. You said that that coat was made for 7 *d.*?

By the sweatee; the sweater got 10 *d.* for it and the woman completed it for 7½ *d.* through all its stages. Now when a finisher gets out work to finish, a woman get trousers at 2¼ *d.* a pair. Before she can begin on those trousers she has to spend 2 *d.* to buy herself thread, cotton and soap, and then she has to provide a fire to heat her iron, and I have often seen in the cold winter season that that fire was only lit once when the woman in the room adjoining would come in and the two women would use that fire for the pressing of the trousers, and it was then that they would take the opportunity of making a little tea, and after they had got it hot, say in the middle of the day, they had to take it for the remainder of the day cold. It is a remarkable thing that very little animal food is taken by those poor people. Of course the reason is obvious, that they have not the means of purchasing it. Then I should like also to say, with regard to the hands that make the button holes at 3 *d.* a dozen, especially those who work for Jews, that they have great difficulty in getting their money.

1369. You said just now that that coat was completed by one woman.

Button-holed and all.

1370. Is that the custom?

That is the general custom, because the woman who takes the coat gives the coat to the button-holer and pays the button-holer out of her 7½ *d.*

1371. Then the one woman did not make that coat?

She did not make it all herself, but she returned it made for 7½ *d.* Button-holers very rarely get their money; they sometimes have to wait a fortnight or three weeks, those that work for Jews I mean; and they have to work very early and very late, beginning sometimes at five in the morning for three or four days in the week. I have often seen the Jews carrying the garments early in the morning to these women to get them button-holed, and the woman, after going down on Friday night, will say, "My work is not passed, and I cannot get paid." The Jew will say the button-holes are not well made. I have had women working for me who said they rarely were able to get their money out of those Jew coat-makers. In this low-class work there are very few Jews employed by sweaters; it is chiefly confined to Christians; and they, many of them, do nothing at all to the garments; they put out no skill and no capital. If a man had 25 *l.*, and wanted to start in this business, he would go to some of the houses and get some gentleman to be security for him; they would give him work out; he would put out a few bills and get some machinists; and then a few bills and get some finishers, give the work out to machinists, and get it back, and then give it to the finishers to finish, keeping back two or three women to press the garments off to give them a nice finish, and take them back to the shops. He would take three days till he sent the goods back completed; and all he requires is capital for the three days, then he is recouped when he takes the work in, as the warehouses generally pay every day; so that the sweater can easily make 4 *l.* or 5 *l.* a week; a sweater who has only 25 *l.* to start with, I have been thinking very seriously about the remedies that ought to be applied to deal with these people, but I do not think it possible that we can touch the finishers by any legislation, as it is home-work. They are constantly coming into the market, according to the rise and fall of the trades, or the occupations that their husbands follow. If the husband gets good work they drop out of the market; if the husband falls out of work, or the work is casual work, they come back into the market. But there are certain things I should suggest for your Lordships' consideration; and one is that every factory ought to be licensed. I had a

factory for two years before it was visited by the inspector; of course he had to find out that we had a factory; and I am perfectly sure that there are many places in the East End of London that are employing these people that the inspectors know nothing of.

1372. What do you mean by a factory?
A factory is a place where more than four women are employed. And I think that before I could open such a place I should be required to get a license from the inspector of the Government, the inspector visiting me and granting such a license.

1373. In order that he should know where it is?
Not only that, but to see that I had the cubic space proper for the number of individuals I intended to employ in that place, and that the abstract of the Act was posted up in a place where every girl could see it. Then, the second is, that the sanitary arrangements, I think, should be under his authority as far as it applied to factories, or, if not, that the sanitary inspectors should be placed under the same control as they are in Scotland, where they are under Imperial and not under the local control of those that are virtually their masters; and that the local officer of health for the district should also be placed under Imperial control. Then I should suggest that we ought to have some female inspectors in connection with such industries where so many women are employed. I should also suggest, that the factory inspector should have power to search the warehouse, because it is a fact that while people may be working after hours, the girls can at once go up stairs to the bed-rooms or downstairs to the kitchen, and the inspector is debarred from entering either the bed-rooms or the kitchen as they are not the factory. I have another suggestion; it is this: that no man should have a registered factory until he can show that he has sufficient capital to carry on such a business. My reason for making such a suggestion is, that many of these women are not paid very regularly; they are "subbed," that is, at the end of the week they perhaps get 5 *s.* out of their wage, and then they get the rest as soon as the sweater has got all his work passed from the warehouse. Now, as to the work we have been enabled to do. For the last two years we have tested what was practicable, and just within the last few months we have put our experience into a more solid and commercial form, and formed what is now called "The Workwomen's Co-operative Association, Limited," the capital being subscribed by various gentlemen in the City taking up shares without receiving any interest thereon. We can show that on commercial lines we can pay our machinists 18 *s.* and 16 *s.* per week, our basters 12 *s.*, and our pressers, women pressers, 12 *s.*, working indoors in a fine factory; and our hand-sewers, finishers, from 10 *s.* to 12 *s.* per week. Then we have been able to let the poor women have sewing machines from the company, at 25 per cent. less than they have had before, on such easy instalments as 8*d.* per week for three years, so that at the end of three years the machine becomes the woman's own property. In this way we save her from the difficulty she had before; formerly she had to pay a deposit of 10 *s.*, then 2 *s.* 6 *d.* per week until she had paid 7 *l.* or 7 *l.* 10 *s.*, and if she had failed in payment the machines were taken away from time to time. One woman had paid over 5 *l.* and lost the whole, because through slackness of work she was unable to keep up the payments. With us the machine is never lost by lapse; we warehouse it until they are able to work again, and then they get it back with the previous payments standing to their credit. We hope by-and-bye to make this purely co-operative, that is our aim, and to start more of those factories.

1374. How many do you employ?
At present we are only employing 90, because one of our factories is closed for alteration, but in about six weeks we hope to have 500 at work.

1375. How long has this factory been in existence?
Over two years.

1276. What were its dimensions at starting; how many did you employ?
I bega n

I began with four people, and then we had over 150 at work; but we closed one of our factories that we might enlarge it, and enlarge the scope of our area.

1377. How many factories are there?
We have two now.

1378. Is the factory all one room?
All one room. One of our factories is a large floor, 126 feet long and 25 feet wide; it is a third floor.

1379. And how many do you employ in that room?
That is the one we are just re-arranging; we shall have about 300 working in connection with that. The other factory is built out on what was a garden behind a dwelling-house in Walden-street, Phillpot-street; the previous factory is in Old Ford.

1380. And you conduct all the operations of the trade in one room, all the branches of it?
All but the finishing, the finishing is peculiarly a home-work with the women of East London.

1381. What do you do in the factory?
We machine all our garments in the factory and press out the seams with the latest improvements in pressing irons; and there we do everything but the felling the sleeve, heads, and coats, and finishing trousers, as shown by Mr. Arnold White; and instead of asking the workers to press off those garments in their own homes we have experienced pressers to press them off and finish them when they come indoors.

1382. You get the goods from the warehouses direct?
Yes, we work for a number of London houses, and also for people in Leicester, Norwich, and Reading, and occasionally work for people in Glasgow.

1383. Do you get the goods on the same terms as the sweaters?
On the same terms, except that we are able by having an efficient manager to turn out better work; we get a good deal of the best class work.

1384. Are you making a profit?
We are showing a small profit.

1385. Do you pay the same price for finishing as the sweaters?
Higher prices.

1386. You mentioned the prices just now?
Yes; I should like to say that while in the ordinary process of things a woman has to buy the cotton and the thread she uses, with us we purchase them, we give her those to do the work with; that is our indoor women; they have not to supply themselves with cotton or soap or thread, we provide that ourselves.

1387. Then you would consider it quite possible to carry on all the trade except the finishing in a factory, in a large factory, and make a fair profit and pay much larger wages than are earned by the people engaged in the trade itself now?
Yes, I should; but it is not practicable to do the whole work in the factory for this reason: that many of those women are married women and could not come out; they have small families and could not leave their families; but those are chiefly the finishers. I should just like to say one word upon the previous portion of my evidence, and it is this, that the sweater is gradually dying out, for this reason: that some of the lower-class houses are now coming in direct contact with the poor people, and saving the margin of profit that was taken by the sweater. There are a number of houses which are actually bringing the poor people right away from the East End of London up to the City and giving them

them small quantities of work that they may thereby save the margin of profit that is taken by the sweater in distributing the work; that is growing yearly.

1388. But the workers are no better off for that?
No, the workers are no better off; the warehouses are.

1389. They save the profit made by the sweater, in fact?
Yes.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Martis, 24° *Aprilis*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of DERBY.
Earl of ONSLOW.
Viscount GORDON (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord CLINTON.
Lord CLIFFORD of CHUDLEIGH.
Lord FOXFORD (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord WIGAN (*Earl of Crawford and Balcarrres*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord ROTHSCHILD.
Lord MONKSWELL.
Lord THRING.

LORD KENRY (EARL OF DUNRAVEN AND MOUNT-EARL), IN THE CHAIR.

The REVEREND JAMES MUNRO, having been called in; is further Examined, as follows:

1390. *Chairman.*] YOU were giving the Committee evidence as to your factories, and you were saying that the sweater was gradually dying out, and that the lower class houses were coming into direct contact with the poor people, saving the margin of profit that was taken by the sweater, and you went on to say that the workmen were no better off on that account, but that the warehouses were?

That is so.

1391. That is the point at which you left off; will you go on with your statement. Have you anything more to say about the working of the factories?

I put in to-day the memorandum of our association, and the prospectus, which gives you the full details of our work (*handing in the same*).

1392. Lord *Thring.*] Is there anything special in the memorandum?

No, it is just merely to show the ground-work upon which the new scheme has been started; there is nothing special in it. The ultimate aim of this scheme is that the workers themselves may become the proprietors of the factories in time.

1393. *Chairman.*] You speak of it as a new scheme; I understood you that it had been in existence in one form or another for some time?

It has been in existence for two years; but within the last few months we have re-constructed it as a limited liability company, and therefore we call it a new scheme, because we have put it on business principles; before, it was purely philanthropic, now it is on purely business principles; the only difference between it and other companies being that no dividend shall be paid to the shareholders, and that the directors shall receive no pecuniary benefit therefrom.

1394. Has this factory been long enough in existence, in your opinion, to practically solve the problem as to whether all this work can be carried on, subject to proper sanitary conditions, and without excessive hours of labour, in factories without ultimately increasing the price of the goods, the cost of production, and without interfering in any way with the trade?

It has been long enough in existence to prove that we can give 25 per cent. more than the sweater gives to the workers, and that they need not be required

to work more than 10 hours a day; but I think it impossible that a scheme of this sort shall ever embrace the whole of the seamstresses of East London.

1395. Has all the cost of this factory, building and machinery and plant, been provided on a business basis?
On a business basis.

1396. At present the shareholders have not taken over the plant and machinery that was provided by charity?
The plant and machinery that was provided by charity has been taken over by Mr. Francis Peek, who has been all along at the bottom of this movement, and supported it both by his time and money, has been taken over in shares in his name, so that it appears in the usual way in business.

1397. Lord *Thring*.] As I understand it, the shares pay no dividend?
The shares pay no dividend.

1398. Then this gentleman gets no profit?
No profit whatever.

1399. Then, *qua* charity, the charity took up a going business, paying nothing for it?
I beg your pardon; charity gave one factory, commerce bought the other; but when charity gave the first factory it was given in shares.

1400. But what I want to get at is this: At the present moment you say it is practically a working business on mercantile principles?
Yes.

1401. But that business on mercantile principles really and truly took up a going business, for which it paid nothing?
The first factory was valued, and put down at a price.

1402. Who paid for the first factory?
The first factory was paid for principally by subscription, and that subscription is now accounted for in the books of the new factory; as the first factory being valued at a certain sum; the shares of that factory are held by Mr. Francis Peek.

1403. But he receives no dividend on them?
No one receives any dividend.

1404. Can you put in the accounts?
Yes, our accountant will put in a statement of account.

1405. Earl of *Derby*.] I understand the company was founded entirely on charitable principles?
On philanthropic principles.

1406. That is to say, 3,000 *l.* have been paid, upon which no return is received or receivable at any time; is not that so?
It is hardly so, because when the workers, by receiving bonuses on their work, are able to purchase the shares from the present shareholders, they then become their own shares, and the factories will then be converted into a co-operative association for the benefit of the workers only.

1407. That is to say, the 3,000 *l.* has only been advanced, and you look forward to a time when it will be repaid by the workpeople taking shares?
To the original shareholders.

1408. But what is the inducement to a workman to take shares if they pay no dividend?
The workwomen taking the shares, the company will then sell the shares to the workwomen for the shares, and it becomes their own property, and they will have equal dividends on the co-operative principle.

1409. But at present, as I understand, whatever profit is made by the factory goes to the workpeople; is not that so?
No.

No. At present whatever profit is made after the first year shall be divided between the workwomen, and a portion put to a sinking fund, and then when the workwomen are able to buy 1 *l.* shares, the shares will be sold to them by the original shareholders, and the property will become their own

1410. Then profit is put by to accumulate?
Yes, to accumulate.

1411. *Chairman.*] The immediate advantage to the workwomen s that they get higher wages?
That is the immediate advantage.

1412. Lord *Sandhurst.*] And shorter hours?
And shorter hours; and better sanitary arrangements.

1413. Lord *Monkswell.*] However long they take in paying off this 3,000 *l.* there will be no interest demanded?
No interest will be demanded.

1414. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] But the direction of the factory is entirely at present in the hands of the shareholders?
In the hands of the directors, who are elected by the shareholders.

1415. Earl of *Onslow.*] How many shareholders have you?
Thirty-eight at present.

1416. And all your capital taken up?
Not all. We have just issued in the prospectus I have handed in to-day an application for another 1,000 *l.*

1417. *Chairman.*] Will you go on now with your general statement?
I shall now submit to your Lordships details as to the work in the making up of garments. Machinists, as a rule, are better paid than finishers. The price paid by manufacturers runs from 4½ *d.* to 10 *d.* per pair of trousers. A good machinist can, in a day of 10 hours, machine from a dozen to a dozen and a half pairs of trousers. The price paid by the sweater runs from 1¼ *d.* to 3¼ *d.* per pair for machining. Out of this the woman has to find her own trimmings, cotton, thread, and soap. If the worker does this work at home she has to pay 2 *s.* 6 *d.* per week for the hire of a sewing machine, besides keeping up a fire and providing irons for the pressing out of the seams of the trousers. The cost of her trimmings, &c., per week average about 1 *s.* 1 *d.* Those who work at home (as a rule) cannot do more work in 16 hours than those who work in a factory for 10 hours. A home worker generally loses one-and-a-half days per week in taking and receiving work from the sweater, besides being often stopped with household duties. Then with regard to finishers, all the workers get for finishing is from 2 *d.* to 3¾ *d.* per pair, that is for pressing off garments, putting on the tickets, making them ready for shop. They lose a good deal of time in getting the work examined, and they have frequently to stand for three or four hours at a time; it is the invariable rule that no seats are provided for the women when they take their work to the sweaters. If the examiner finds the first two or three pair of trousers faulty, he will not go through the whole work, but throws them at her, and tells her to take them back and alter them. In this way she loses two days in doing one day's work. The sweater generally gives the work out in the morning, to be returned in the evening, or in the afternoon, to be returned the following morning. Little children are often employed in going for the work, or taking back work in the afternoon. The finisher being anxious to finish as many pairs as possible often has to work to two o'clock in the morning to get her work completed. A smart worker can finish eight pairs of trousers per day; the lowest price is 2 *d.*, and the highest is 9 *d.*, for finishing the work. The finisher has to provide her own cotton, her silk for making button-holes, and her gimp, her soap, her fire for pressing off, and her oil for her lamp, because a great deal of her work is done at night. While there is always plenty of the cheap work in the season, there is very little of what is called the better class work. Finishers, as a rule, very rarely make more than 7 *s.* per week; I should think the average would run about

5 *s.* 6 *d.* The price paid for men's trousers runs from 4½ *d.* to 1 *s.* 4 *d.* per pair from the warehouse, and the price paid for machining the same runs from 1¼ *d.* to 5 *d.* The machinist can do eight pairs of the better class, and a dozen and three pairs of the lower class. The finishers on this work can do from three to eight pairs per day. Machinists make from 14 *s.* to 18 *s.* per week, exclusive of their trimmings, and the finishers on this work from 5 *s.* to 9 *s.* per week, exclusive of their trimmings. With regard to boys' vests, the price from the warehouse runs from 5 *d.* to 8 *d.*, and men's vests from 6 *d.* to 1 *s.* 2 *d.* They are generally given to one hand to make right out, and she generally employs a woman to make the button-holes, for which she pays from 2½ *d.* to 3 *d.* per dozen, this hand having to find her own gimp and silk. The prices paid by the sweater on these vests run from 4 *d.* to 11 *d.* A good worker can make from four to eight vests a day, according to quality. What are called sack coats or jackets run from 7 *d.* to 10 *d.* as warehouse price; the sweater's price for making these runs from 5½ *d.* to 8 *d.* Youths' overcoats come from the warehouses at from 10 *d.* to 1 *s.* 6 *d.* each, and the sweater's price for making these youths' overcoats runs from 8 *d.* to 1 *s.* 2 *d.* Men's sack coats run from 9 *d.* to 1 *s.* 3 *d.*, and these are paid by the sweater at prices running from 7½ *d.* to 1 *s* 1 *d.* Overcoats run from 2 *s.* to 3 *s.*, women's work, and these are paid by the sweater from 1 *s.* 6 *d.* to 2 *s.* 3 *d.* Juvenile suits are made from 6 *d.* up to 5 *s.* each, and the price paid by the sweater differs according to quality; the lowest price is 4½ *d.* Suits that are given to the sweater at 1 *s.* 2 *d.* are given out by him again to be made right out for 8 *d.*; the workers themselves have also reduced the prices for making considerably. It often happens that poor women will cut one another down; in fact the price for making up garments is very often regulated by the labour market, the male labour market; and when there is plenty of work for men the women do not seek work in the same numbers, and when their husbands are out of work, or only doing casual work, then they come flocking to the sweaters for work. In this way the seamstress labour market is regulated by the rise and fall of the male labour market in East London. There is one suggestion that occurs to me in connection with this, and that is, that if we could stop the people coming up from the provinces we would materially aid the seamstresses of East London. In one walk that I took between night and morning with Mr. Arnold White, we found as many as 70 people on the streets of London who had come up from the provinces that very day. We started about half-past twelve on the Sunday morning, and we found that 70 people had come up during the Saturday from the provinces.

1418. Lord *Onslow.*] How did you ascertain that they had come from the provinces?

We spoke to them individually, and from there dialect it was patent which county they had come from; and we were able to verify many cases, as we wrote letters of inquiry, and I did not find a single man making a false statement. I verified about 20 of the statements.

1419. What class were they?

Chiefly agricultural labourers; also roads men; some were engineers; it was the time when the strike was on the Tyneside, and a good many were ships carpenters and labourers from the Tyneside?

1420. How did you ascertain that they were chiefly agricultural labourers—by their own statements?

By their own statements; and their dress almost indicated they were men that had been working on the soil.

1421. Lord *Sandhurst.*] Were there women amongst them?

Very few women; we have found as many as 300 people homeless on the streets at night; I do not think we have found more than 10 per cent. women; some of them have little children. But, for the most part, those men come up first themselves, and gradually settle down in London, and then bring their wives and families; and this work being of a nature that requires very little skill, the consequence is that they very readily turn to the making-up of garments,

ments, and the result is, that we have the seamstress-market flooded every year, not only from our own distressed people in the East End but from women coming up from the provinces. Then too many of those women have been doing a little work of that sort in provincial towns, such as Chatham, Colchester, and Leeds, and therefore it only requires a very little extra knowledge of the London trade to start them at once making up this sort of work. Therefore I should suggest that if something were done in the way of opening up inducements for agricultural labourers to remain on the soil in the various districts, that would benefit these poor women considerably. The best prices paid by manufacturers are principally from Jewish houses, and I find from contact with the wholesale trade, that on the whole they treat their hands better than our Christian houses do theirs. I had the books of one of the large wholesale clothiers under my observation, and I found that in the slack season he very generously gives loans to his hands, ranging from 2 *l.* to 5 *l.* and 7 *l.*, to aid them in the slack season; and in my business experience in this work for the last two years, I have had more pleasure in dealing with Jewish houses than I have had in dealing with Christian houses. There are not so many Jewish houses in the trade as I think is generally reported. I do not think, in the whole of the kingdom there are more than a dozen wholesale Jewish clothing houses; there are many in the retail trade, but I do not think there are more than a dozen wholesale Jewish houses. There is one Jewish firm who have stated to me that they are quite prepared to raise the price for making 25 per cent. on all their garments, provided that the trade would adopt the same principle; and if that were adopted, the result would be that we would have no starvation among those women; they would be very well off indeed. I should just like to put in a book of one of the workers to show you that it is impossible for a woman to accurately understand the books that they get, or to tell whether she has been receiving a full reward for her labours. This (*handing in a little book*) is one of the workers' books.

1422. *Chairman.*] You appear to attribute the pressure in the trade to competition from the provinces?

Partly to competition from the provinces and partly to the want of employment for males in the East End of London.

1423. And you think that the competition from the provinces is that of agricultural labourers to a large extent?

Principally agricultural labourers and roads-men.

1424. Earl of *Onslow.*] What do you mean by roads men, tramps?

Men that work on the roads.

1425. *Chairman.*] That of course is only according to your own judgment?

Yes; but that is the observation I have made in an experience extending over two years, going out one night a week during the winter season.

1426. Do you think you could distinguish a real agricultural labourer?

I think so; I have had a good deal to do with poor people during the last 15 years, and I think I can distinguish an agricultural labourer, when I meet him, from another man.

1427. Then these people's wives go into this business and cause a glut in the market, you say?

Yes.

1428. You have not said anything about competition from without, from Jewish immigrants?

The Jewish immigrants do not touch this class of work that I am speaking of, which was shown to your Lordships at the last sitting of the Committee. The Jewish work is confined almost entirely to men's work, such as coats and some vests. There are a few Jews who have trouser establishment. There is one (one of the witnesses, for instance, to-day will speak of working for him) who has no factory of his own, who gives out the trousers to be finished and made

off the premises; but very few of them deal with Christians; the Jews generally employ Jews, except that they employ Christians, women to do the button-holes.

1429. Are the people you come in contact with chiefly Jews or Christians?
Christians.

1430. You said just now that some of the Jewish large wholesale houses gave loans to their hands in slack times?
Yes.

1431. What do you mean by their "hands," the people that work in their factories?
The people that work for them.

1432. Outside?
Yes. The Jews, as a rule, seldom have factories of their own; very few of them have.

1433. You said just now that a woman working in a factory could do in ten hours as much work as she could do at home in 16?
Yes.

1434. And you gave as one of the reasons that her time is broken up at home by attending to household duties?
Yes.

1435. If she was working in a factory, how would these household duties be discharged?
If she was working in a factory she would put her little ones out to a *crèche* to be looked after there; there are a number of them in the East End. Then she would be home sufficiently early to do a little house-work before going to bed at night, and she would have her Saturday afternoon.

1436. Lord *Thring*.] Do I rightly understand you that the agricultural labourer comes to London with the view that his wife will be employed here?
He comes to London with the view of getting employment for himself.

1437. And how does he get employment himself in the tailoring trade?
No; he gets casual employment, very often down at the docks. Then by-and-by he sends for his wife, hoping that things will turn up better in the town by-and-by.

1438. Then the agricultural labourer has nothing to do with this present inquiry?
No; the only reason I introduced him was, because his wife has to do with it.

1439. He comes and works in the dock, and his wife comes into the tailoring and sweating?
Yes; he generally tramps up to London, and then by-and-by he sends for his wife and family.

1440. And then they go into this work?
Yes.

1441. You know the agricultural labourer by his dialect, if I understand you right?
I know the countryman by his dialect; I generally know the agricultural labourer by his manner and his talk.

1442. Earl of *Onslow*.] You said that you had verified the fact as to the place of origin of some of these people?
In about 20 cases.

1443. And how many of those 20 cases were agricultural labourers?
They were all agricultural labourers.

1444. They

1444. They were proved to be agricultural labourers?
Yes.

1445. Do you believe that there is a general immigration of agricultural labourers from the country into the town?
I am certain of that.

1446. What leads you to suppose that?
Because in my tramping about the streets at night, in connection with my work, I come in contact with those flocking up from the country.

1447. Have you ever made inquiries in the country districts what they were?
They were all men in middle life; the average age would run from 30 to 35, and 40?

1448. Have you any reason to know whether they live in cottages of their own in the country?
I could not say; my only inquiry was as to their character, and with whom they had been employed.

1449. Would you tell me how many cases, on the whole, you have investigated of agricultural labourers coming up to London?
Mr. Arnold White and I were together in this work, and there were 5,700 cases that came under our notice, and 20 per cent. of those were agricultural labourers.

1450. Only 20 per cent. of the whole?
Of the whole.

1451. You verified those cases from the country?
Yes.

1452. The whole of the 20 per cent.?
Yes.

1453. May I ask you what you understand by the country; do you mean small villages?
Villages 30 to 40 miles from London.

1454. I mean what size village would you call a country district?
I would call Colchester, and Chatham, and Rochester a country district.

1455. Lord *Clinton*.] You are acting now as an employer of labour?
Yes.

1456. We heard that the wages of the workers for the last five years have been very much diminished generally?
Yes, they have.

1457. Can you tell us about the prices of materials in your trade?
They have gone down 25 per cent.; I had that from one of the manufacturers.

1458. But the wages of the workers have not increased?
They have gone down.

1459. Can you say anything about the price to the consumer of the goods, the price of the materials forming which, you say, has considerably diminished?
The price to the consumer has gone down in a considerable ratio.

1460. The only thing that has not altered has been the earnings of the workers?
They have gone down.

1461. Not increased?
No.

1462. Lord *Sandhurst.*] You said, I think, that the women sent their small children to a *crèche*?

Some of those that work in the factories do.

1463. Do they have to pay for that in addition?

Some pay 1 *d.*, some 2 *d.*, a day; Miss Hilton, I think, has one of the largest, and she charges 2 *d.* a day.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. WILLIAM HAWES, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

1464. *Chairman.*] What is your business?

I am manager now of the Working Women's Co-operative Association, Limited. Previous to that I was in business myself for 14 years in the clothing trade.

1465. In what capacity?

As employer myself.

1466. Perhaps you would tell the Committee what your business was?

As a manufacturer of clothing for the wholesale houses in general. The prices have gone down since I commenced business, some 30 per cent. No doubt the Jews have lowered the prices very much; I have frequently seen work offered to them at starvation prices which they have refused to make, but I have seen other Jews watch their opportunities for these people to retire from the wholesale warehouse, upon which they immediately go up and take the work at a much lower price. Christians and Jews are compelled to take work at a low price by the manufacturers refusing to give them any work until they have taken the work offered to them. In this way sometimes they keep them for a week or longer without work until they are glad to take it. It is a common occurrence that hands who grumble about prices in the busy season are punished severely in the slack season, by giving them little or no work to do. It is a well known fact that in many of the warehouses they are now going direct to the poor people, thus saving the profit of the sweater. These poor people by going to the city houses lose on the average two days per week for the passing of their work. I should wish to conceal the names of certain houses in my statement. There are certain houses who sometimes refuse to give the work to the hands on account of the high prices, delaying them until they see whether other people will come in and submit to a lower price.

1467. When you say "high prices," do you mean the high wages that they want?

Yes; that is, some hands reserve their price on the labour and will not go from it to one of these particular houses. A partner in one of these houses said to me some time ago, that the people whom I employed were earning a damned sight too much, as he considered that 7 *s.* or 8 *s.* a week was plenty for a girl or woman to live upon. When I rebuked that sentiment, and called his attention to the fact that so many women were on the town, and many of them women that I knew in the trade personally, he replied that that had nothing to do with him; they wanted this work made at their price, and if girls and women choose to do so let them do so, if they were not satisfied to live upon 7 *s.* or 8 *s.* per week. He further stated that these poor people did not require to eat meat more than once per week, and then not roast beef, as they were too low to know the value of money. He observed that he had seen meat marked at 2½ *d.* to 3 *d.* per pound, which he considered was quite good enough for them to live upon. I then asked him if he could live upon it; he laughed at me, and said that it was not a question as to what he could live upon, but what he was telling me he considered was good enough for my people. On the same day I submitted our new designs for the forthcoming season; he wished me to leave these, as he pretended he had not time to look through them. I will

will call your attention to these. These are samples of the style. I was the first introducer some few years ago in bringing out these things to submit to the houses; instead of making the garments up, to show what they would look like, there is a *fac simile*. These are the designs that I left in charge of him (*producing certain garments.*) Those are samples showing the design of the suit, how it would look when made up. He wished me to leave these samples, as he pretended he had no time to look through them. During the interim he got these designs copied, and he gave me but very few orders; and shortly afterwards I discovered that he had these new designs made cheaper by other individuals. When I called his attention to this fact, he said that did not matter to me, as he had been able to get these produced at a much lower price. During the long time I have been in this trade, I have seen men who know nothing of the trade, and who were poor, who have now retired on the profits they have made, without having had to spend a single penny on machinery, or to keep any factories. One of these men, whom I know, recently stated to me that he never went to bed on a Saturday night unless he had saved or put away 30 sovereigns out of the profits that he would make in one week. There are also two other men whom I could name, who have done the same thing. There is also one man who gets his living in this sweating system by letting out sample coats to the poor foreign Jews, charging them as much as 2 *s.* 6 *d.* for the loan of a coat, I myself have seen this coat produced in more than one house on the same day, and by different men. On the question of prices, I can furnish you with the prices paid by the warehouses, and the cost of making all these garments.

1468. I think we have had all that in evidence already; I do not think we need trouble you with that. I do not quite clearly understand from what you said what it is that you complain of in the present position of the clothing trade. You object to the amount of profits which some of the manufacturers or masters make, and you object to a man using samples which you left with him. That seems to me to have been an act of indiscretion on your own part; but I do not quite understand what practical objection you have to raise to the present condition of the trade. I notice that you say that the people now have to go to the wholesale houses themselves to get work, because the tendency is to do away with the sweaters?

That is the tendency; these large warehouse people many years ago kept factories of their own, but they have closed those factories.

1469. Do you consider that the existence of the sweater is an advantage to the working people?

Not in my opinion.

1470. But you said that they are worse off now as the sweaters were gradually becoming abolished, because they have to go and get the work themselves?

They are a great deal worse off than they were at the time when the wholesale warehouses kept their own factories, because then they paid the people a fair and just price.

1471. That is not an answer to my question. I understand you to say that when the sweaters are done away with, the result is that the workpeople have to go long distances to the wholesale houses to get the work?

That they will.

1472. Then it appears to me if that be so, that the existence of the sweater is an advantage to them?

It is an advantage provided he had proper places for the people to work in, and that he should be compelled to have his own machinery; but not making his living out of these poor people in the manner in which he does.

1473. How long have you been engaged in the trade?

I have been 20 years in it.

1474. Manufacturing?

Fourteen years making up for myself; six years previous to that I was in a situation.

1475. Why did you leave the business?
I left this business simply to be the manager to this association, to benefit, or try to benefit, the workers; that has been my sole object in selling my business and devoting the amount of time to this which I intend to do.

1476. Will you tell us how long the co-operative society has been in existence?
It is the third week now.

1477. You cannot say much about it, therefore?
We cannot say much about it?

1478. Lord *Rothschild.*] Will you tell us why the manufacturers closed their factories; because you said that formerly they had factories of their own and that they closed them?
They simply closed them for the sake of obtaining the labour cheaper; they found it come too expensive for them to keep factories on, and they went direct to these poor people to have their work made at a much lower rate. I was in one of the largest factories, H. E. and M. Moses, for some few years; these people paid their hands a considerable lot more money than what these sweaters are able to do; and that is the reason.

1479. Lord *Monkswell.*] One question about the sweaters; do I understand that the sweaters go round and collect the clothes that they leave in the houses, or are the women obliged to take the clothes themselves to the warehouse?
The sweaters go to the wholesale houses.

1480. And the poor people have to go to these sweaters for them?
They do in many cases.

1481. They have to go to the factory in one case and to the sweater in the other case?
Yes.

1482. *Chairman.*] I gather from you that the best of all systems, in your opinion, is where all the work is carried out in a factory?
It is.

1483. And that, next to that, it is an advantage to the workers to have the sweater as a kind of agent between them and the factory?
I should say it is.

1484. And that the present condition of things, where the sweater is being done away with, is the worst of all?
It is.

1485. Lord *Thring.*] I understand you to say that the factories were given up because they did not pay?
Because they cost so much money to keep them going.

1486. In other words, because they did not pay?
Yes.

1487. And your proposition is that factories that do not pay should be kept up in order to raise the price of wages?
No; the factories were closed by these wholesale people, to let the work go into the sweater's hands to obtain it cheaper.

1488. Supposing they would obtain the work cheaper by its going into the sweater's hands, it is clear that the sweater would outbid them or make it impossible to carry on the factories?
Yes.

1489. Therefore your only remedy, as I understand it, is that men should be found who will carry on factories at a loss?
No, I do not say that. I say that the wholesale houses should pay the sweater a just price, so that he could keep a respectable and proper factory to enable him to pay these poor people a just and fair price.

1490. *Chairman.*]

1490. *Chairman.*] Am I to understand you that in your opinion the manufacturers did make a profit before, and that they make a better profit by closing their large workshops and by putting out the work?
That is exactly so.

1491. Earl of *Derby.*] You spoke of a just price; how do you define a just price?
You cannot consider it a just price to pay a woman 2 *d.* and 2¼ *d.* for a pair of trousers, when these wholesale houses in former days paid as much as 9 *d.* and 10 *d.*, to finish a pair of trousers in a factory.

1492. But how would you prevent these very low prices being paid, if the persons employed are willing to work at that rate?
By simply having all the clothing made in factories, not in the work-places that they are now made in, these dens; that is my proposition.

1493. Would you prohibit legally the making of clothes otherwise than in factories?
I would.

1494. You would not allow people to work at home in that occupation?
I would not; I would have all clothing made in factories.

1495. Earl of *Onslow.*] With regard to these factories which were closed, were they in London, or the country?
In London.

1496. Are you aware that a number of factories have been opened in the country, and that it has been found that the work done there competes on favourable terms in regard to price with the work done by the sweaters?
I have heard of it recently, in the country.

1497. Then do not you think that the result of driving the work out of the sweaters' houses in London would be to drive it into factories in the country?
I do not think so.

1498. If factories will not pay in London, and do pay in the country, is it not probable that the trade will be driven into factories in the country?
The people who have these factories in the country are paying their people different prices from what the London manufacturer is paying.

1499. I presume that is because they can afford to run factories cheaper in the country than they do in London, owing to the price of rent and so on?
I think it is to suit their own purposes, and that is the reason they are opening these factories. The goods are costing more money because they are paying better wages, and they are able to produce a better article.

1500. How do you know that the goods are costing more money?
I have it from friends; I have two friends in Leeds who are managers.

1501. Do you think it probable that commercial men would open factories in the country if it cost them more than they could make the same things for in London?
I think it is so, that they have opened factories for that purposes.

1502. Supposing that the closing of the sweaters' shops should result in the increase of the factories in the country, do not you think those people now employed in the sweaters' shops would lose their employment altogether by reason of the work moving into the country?
Yes.

1503. Lord *Clinton.*] Were these factories closed because the manufacturers were making no profit, or was it with a view to making a larger profit?
I think with the view of making a larger profit. Most of the factories, to my knowledge, did pay. I was manager to one for seven years and that paid. It was closed because the stuff could be made cheaper out of doors. I do not

suggest closing the sweater factories, but these small dens with three or four or half-a-dozen hands; and allow the clothing to be manufactured in respectable and healthy factories.

1504. *Chairman.*] You said just now that you would prohibit the work being done at home; do you really mean that you would not allow women to do any sewing-machine work in their own houses?

The sewing-machine work I should not allow; I object to it. There are many parts in the clothing trade that certainly must be done at home by people, such as hand-work.

1505. That is what I want to find out from you. You say now that some of the work must be done at home; you said just now you would not allow any to be done at home?

I should have stated any of the machined portion of the garments.

1506. Earl of *Onslow.*] But assuming that it does not pay to have factories in London, and that it does pay to have them in the country, would it be possible to send from the country the work produced by the sewing machines to people at their homes in London?

It would be possible.

1507. I do not understand how it would be possible to send work to the people's homes; would they come and fetch it?

They would have an agent in London, and the poor people would go to the agent in the way it is done at the present time.

1508. Do you know of a case of work being sent from the country?

I do.

1509. Lord *Monkswell.*] Can you give the Committee any reason why it should be almost a universal rule that it should be factory work at Leeds, and home work in London; why did not the sweaters go to Leeds and carry out the same system there?

I have known a number who have gone to Leeds, and are carrying on the work in much the same style there.

1510. Do you think, then, that the system of sweating is going to Leeds?

I do.

1511. Do you think that in a short time it will be as bad there as in London?

Yes. I know several cases of large sweaters who have gone to Leeds in the last few years; they are making a very good living there.

1512. Earl of *Crawford and Balcarres.*] You said a minute ago that you objected to people working in private houses, and then you qualified that by saying that you objected to their working in these dens; would it meet your views if the working of the Factory Acts were extended to a greater extent than it is now, so as to take in what you call dens, and yet still allow the work to go on there, but under restrictive legislation?

Quite so.

1513. Therefore, you would not object to six or seven persons meeting together in the house of a sweater working, provided the accommodation they had and the hours of working were under further restrictive legislation?

Yes. Our factory inspectors have not sufficient authority. I kept a factory for nine years out of 14, and never saw the factory inspector.

1514. Earl of *Onslow.*] What class of people were employed in your factory?

Females; no male labour.

1515. Any young persons?

Not under 16.

1516. Lord *Rothschild.*] And how many hours did they work?

Ten hours.

1517. Lord

1517. Lord *Thring.*] What is the date you are referring to?
It is now about five years ago since I first saw an inspector in my factory.

1518. You kept your factory for nine years without seeing an inspector; I want to know in what year those nine years began, and in what year they ended?
It would be in 1874 that I began, and it would be 1882 or 1883 before I saw the inspector. I might state that when the factory inspector arrived he was perfectly satisfied with the state of the factory, which is the present factory now of the Working Women's Co-operative Association. I carried it out strictly, I was so well acquainted with it.

1519. Earl of *Onslow.*] Had you any machinery in your factory?
Yes; we had some 35 people at work there at the time he came in.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mrs. ISABELLA KILLICK is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

1520. *Chairman.*] What business are you engaged in?
On the trouser finishing. I have worked at it now about 22 years altogether; it is paid for now so terribly bad.

1521. What class of work do you do?
Finishing.

1522. Finishing trousers?
Yes.

1523. And you have been in the business 22 years?
Yes.

1524. How many can you finish in a day now?
I cannot do more than four.

1525. Is there anybody working with you?
No, only myself; and I have got an afflicted husband; he is dying; I do not know whether he will be dead when I get back or not; he is in an infirmary. I have three children to support; the eldest 10 years of age, and the youngest three.

1526. What do you get?
I get 4½ *d.*, 3¾ *d.*, and 5 *d*, up to 6 *d.*; it is in my book.

1527. What do you earn a week?
I have to find my own materials; I cannot earn more than 1 *s.* 2 *d.* a day; and I have to find my own materials and fire and lighting out of it.

1528. What materials have you to find?
For the twist holes, 4½ *d.* work, you have your twist to buy; there is gimp and soap, black cotton, white cotton, and red cotton, and black thread; or white thread if they are white buttons.

1529. You mean that you are paid 1 *s.* 2 *d.*, including all those articles?
I have trimmings to find out of that 1 *s.* 2 *d.*; if they are 3½ *d.* ones they are cotton holes, but if they are twist holes they are 4½ *d.*; the twist will cost you 1½ *d.* for the four sets of holes.

1530. How much does it come to?
Altogether I do not clear 1 *s.* a day, not after finding my own trimmings, firing and all, because there are many trimmings to find; and then I have to work many hours to do that. I am up at six o'clock every morning, and never done till eight at night. I am obliged to get in at a quarter-past eight, because the door closes.

1531. What do you pay out of that for rent?
Two shillings; and I have to support three children out of it; the eldest is only 10 years of age; there are three children, one 10, one seven, and one four years next July; that is the youngest.

1532. Your husband is in an infirmary, you say?
Yes. I was there at eight o'clock this morning to see him; he is paralysed all on one side; he has been there nine weeks.

1533. How long has he been laid up?
Three years the 10th of May he has been laid up.

1534. Are the prices worse or better now than they were?
Worse. Four years ago they were paid better for; there is a penny a pair come down on trousers; I can put it to four years ago.

1535. You have had a long experience?
I have.

1536. Can you tell me, did prices rise during the first 10, 15, or 20 years?
No, they never rose; they have gone down.

1537. When did they begin to go down?
To tell the truth, they have been going down this 10 years; I can put it to 10 years, for it is my eldest boy's age.

1538. Can you account for it in any way?
There are so many of those foreign Jews, who come and take it one against the other; one will go in and put it so much cheaper than another, and that is how it is the work is brought down as it is; that is how the trade is brought down.

1539. From your own knowledge do the Jews do any of this work at all?
Yes, it is a Jew that I work for; but he pays pretty fair to what some of them do, because he will not take his work so bad as some of them will; he is an English Jew. Some of them will take them for 5 *d.* out of the warehouse, and sometimes he will pay you 5 *d.* for finishing one.

1540. I understand you that the Jews do not make the garments themselves?
No, they go to the warehouses and take them out. My employer that I work for, sometimes, will not take the work; others will go and take work for half the price that he will take it out for; they will indeed.

1541. How is that; because he is a better-natured man?
I do not know how it is; that is how it is with the workmen, and I think he is about the best one that does pay for it right round our quarter.

1542. Do you get about the same amount of work all the year round?
No, because it falls off slack at a certain time of the year; about two months before Christmas it falls off, then it does not start again till a month after Christmas; about three months of the year is slack.

1543. What do you get to do then?
I am glad to get anything to do, a bit of cleaning or washing; I cannot be without work, as I have three little ones to support.

1544. During the rest of the year you can get as much of this kind of work as you can do?
Yes.

1545. How do you get the materials; have you to go and fetch them?
I have to go for it; I go for my work, and take it back again.

1546. Yourself?
Yes; of course my children are not old enough to take it.

1547. Lord *Rothschild.*] Before your husband was paralysed he used to work also?
Yes; he was a boiler-maker by trade.

1548. What

1548. What wages did he earn?
He earned good wages; of course they do earn good wages; their wages cannot be cut down; they were in a club.

1549. Your husband earned good wages, and you took to tailoring and got something extra?
I always did do the tailoring; I never liked to sit idle.

1550. It is only since your husband has been ill that you are entirely dependent on the work you can get?
Yes, this last three years.

1551. *Chairman.*] Do you use a sewing machine?
No, my work is all machined for me; I finish.

1552. Lord *Rothschild.*] Does your husband get an allowance from his club now?
No; he was very much afflicted before he was laid up this three years by rheumatism, and they scratched him in the club this seven years; only three years he has been afflicted, and altogether laid up.

1553. But you took to tailoring first to earn extra wages; your husband was earning good wages?
Yes, but I always did a bit of work; but this last three years I have been on it entirely. I was apprenticed to the trade.

1554. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] Has the money which you have earned been sufficient to provide food?
No, it has not, but I have had to make it do.

1555. What is the food you get chiefly?
Chiefly, I get a herring and a cup of tea; that is the chief of my living, with the rent to pay, and three children eating very hearty. As for meat, I do not expect; I get meat once in six months.

1556. Are there any others working in the same way where you live?
There is nobody in the same house that works as I work; I do not associate with any; I am very glad to get into the shop and out again as quickly as I can.

1557. Lord *Monkswell.*] Do your neighbours ever give you anything?
No; I have nothing to live on but what I work for.

1558. But I suppose you help one another if you have had a good week?
No, nothing of that at all.

1559. Earl of *Crawford and Balcarres.*] I take it from what you said that you manage to clear 1 *s.* a day by your work after providing your materials?
After the trimmings.

1560. Then there is 2 *s.* for rent?
Yes.

1561. Therefore all you have is 5 *s.* a week really to live upon?
Yes.

1562. And out of that you have to pay firing, and your living?
Yes, firing and lights.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

24*th April* 1888.

Mrs. MARY HAYES, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

1563. *Chairman.*] Where do you live?
14, Maplin-street.

1564. What is your trade?
Trouser finishing.

1565. Your husband was a soldier, was he not?
Yes.

1566. How long have you been in this trade?
I was in the trade before I was married, but when I got married to my husband of course I had to do the army work, such as washing; and since the death of my husband of course I have done the work, because I knew it from a girl; I was always in the line.

1567. How long is it since your husband died?
Nineteen years on the 5th of next June.

1568. You have been 19 years at trouser finishing?
Yes.

1569. Have you any children?
Yes.

1570. What ages, and how many?
I have got three children; I say "children." I have two daughters at home. I have got one that has been in the infirmary since she has left a situation. Off and on she has been laid up with rheumatism, and likewise with rheumatic fever.

1571. And the other?
The other has been a delicate girl from the birth; she has never been fit for any situation, but she assists me with the work as far as she can.

1572. Perhaps you will tell the Committee the prices you get for these trousers?
I get from 2¾ *d.* to 3 *d.* I have had more years ago; I have had 4½ *d.* for twist holes, and I have had 4 *d.* for all cotton holes; but then that is some years ago.

1573. You have had 4 *d.* and 4½ *d.* for what you now get 2¾ *d.* and 3 *d.* for?
Yes, for what I now get 2¾ *d.* for I used five years ago to get 4 *d.*; they are all cotton holes.

1574. How many can you make a week?
With me and my assistant, my daughter, I do about eight pair a day. I call it a day, but it is not a day; I do not feel able to sit the hours I used to do. Sometimes I sit from eight in the morning until 10, or sometimes at 11 at night.

1575. Did you hear what the witness before you said as to the price of materials, and so on; I suppose you would have to pay the same price?
The same price; because I suppose, to take the trimmings of the work, that there is hardly a farthing difference in all the work so far as that goes.

1576. How much can you make a day?
With me and my daughter, the hours that we sit, we do about eight pairs a day; that is, when I can get them.

1577. What will that come to?
If they are 2¾ *d.*, if I have a day's work, that is 1 *s.* 10 *d.* for the day.

1578. And

1578. And out of that you find materials?
Yes, I have to find threads and cottons.

1579. And what do you consider you can clear?
Of course, when I take my trimmings and all that out, it leaves me but a very little clear; to take the average I do not suppose it leaves above 5*s.* 6*d.* a week when trimmings are taken; I do not think I am much out of the way in saying that.

1580. During the winter have you good work?
No, I lose a deal by slack time in the winter.

1581. How long is the slack time?
About two months before Christmas; this year it has been very bad indeed.

1582. Do you find any other kind of work to do then?
I do not feel able to do much other sort of work; I have not very good health myself since I have been left a widow. I have got now, at this present time, an abscess at the back of the left eye that I have been suffering from for years.

1583. You work now from about eight in the morning till 10 or 11 at night?
Yes.

1584. Used you ever to work longer hours than that?
I used to work longer when I was younger.

1585. You used to work harder?
Yes; of course I cannot do that now.

1586. What could you earn when prices were better, five or six years ago?
When the children were little I could earn, I dare say, from 10*s.* to 11*s.* a week at that time; but then that is some years ago.

1587. When did prices begin to get so bad?
That is a good many years ago now; but then I daresay for this last five years they have come down a great deal more than that.

1588. Do you think there are more people engaged in the same business now than there were then?
I think so.

1589. What is your ordinary food?
I am almost ashamed to tell the gentlemen. Of course you must know that it cannot be very good food; I know that very little meat comes to the house out of it.

1590. What do you pay for meat?
When I do get any it is 8*d.* a pound, and if I get a pound of it, it has to be for Sunday; that is as much as I can get when I can afford to be out of that little money.

1591. Do you have meat once a week?
Sometimes I do, and sometimes I do not. I generally try to struggle to have a bit on a Sunday, if I can possibly at all.

1592. And what is your ordinary diet, bread?
Bread and a cup of tea, and such as a bit of fish, or anything of that sort.

1593. What rent do you pay?
Two shillings a week.

1594. How do you manage to pay that during the slack times in the winter?
I have to pay it as well as I possibly can; I owe nothing of it.

1595. Do you have to fetch your work?
My daughter, she goes after the work.

1596. How far has she to go?
It is not a great distance from where I am living.

1597. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] About the rent, if you get into arrears, how much time are you allowed?
She is a very good landlady that I am now living with; she will not compel me to any particular time; I could pay it the best way I could get it.

1598. Lord *Monkswell.*] What were your former hours when you were strong; how many used you to work?
Perhaps it might be 12 o'clock at night and much earlier, beginning in the morning.

1599. How early beginning?
I might begin, perhaps, at six, sometimes at seven.

1600. And work generally till 12, or only sometimes?
Only sometimes.

1601. When did you leave off, usually, if you began at six or seven, when you were strong?
Sometimes about 10 o'clock.

1602. Then your hours would be usually from 6 or 7 to 10 at night?
Yes.

1603. How many days a week did you work like that?
I might have a little time just to do a bit of cleaning, either me or my daughter.

1604. Otherwise you would work the whole seven days; could you afford not to work on Sunday?
I never do any work on a Sunday, not such as that work.

1605. You say you earn 5 *s.* 6 *d.* a week; does that include your daughter's earnings?
That is with me; she does not do much, because she has to run about.

1606. When you get 1 *s.* 10 *d.* a day, that must make more than 5 *s.* 6 *d.* a week?
Sometimes I have trousers that I get 3 *d.* for.

1607. Then how much would you deduct for materials?
There is firing, and the thread and the twist, and the oil; I know it comes to 1 *s.* 6 *d.*; that is with the firing and the trimming.

1608. One shilling and sixpence a week?
Yes, because I have all colours of thread and cotton to find.

1609. *Chairman.*] Do you work by gas light?
With a lamp.

1610. I forgot to ask you whether you use a sewing machine in your work?
No.

1611. Why not?
I do not use any sewing machine; I am a finisher.

1612. Do you mean that a sewing machine could not be used in finishing?
Of course it can be, but I am too old to do it now; I could not use the machine.

1613. Why not?
My nerves would never let me; I have hard work sometimes to see to thread the needle, much more a machine.

1614. Other finishers do use a machine?
Oh, yes; there are some that can finish and machine together.

1615. Could you earn better wages if you were able to use a machine?
I dare say I could, if I was able to do such a thing; but I cannot properly sit in a room when I hear the noise of a machine.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

24th April 1888.

MRS. LAVINIA CASEY is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

1616. *Chairman.*] ARE you married?
Yes.

1617. What is your husband?
A dock labourer.

1618. Is he out of work, or has he got work?
He was at work yesterday; he is not doing anything to-day.

1619. Has he been in work generally for the last six months?
No; only just a day or two now and then, as there was work in the docks for him; sometimes he has been at work one, two, or three days in the week; sometimes not at all.

1620. You are a shirt machinist?
Yes.

1621. Will you describe to the Committee what the nature of your work is?
I make shirts at 7 *d.* and 8 *d.* a dozen; I have to pay for my own cotton out of it, and I have to pay 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a week for the machine; I have to pay half-a-crown a week on the hiring system for it.

1622. How many can you make in a day?
Two dozen; and I have little children to attend to.

1623. You can make two dozen a day at 7 *d.* a dozen?
Yes.

1624. That is 1 *s.* 2 *d.* a day?
Yes.

1625. What have you to find?
A reel of cotton and oil for my machine out of that.

1626. Two shillings and sixpence a week for your sewing machine, you say?
Yes.

1627. What do you think your materials come to; the cotton and so on you have to find?
About 1 *s.* to 1 *s.* 3 *d.* a week.

1628. Lord *Rothschild.*] You have got 4 *s.* 6 *d.* a week left?
Yes, that is all; sometimes not that.

1629. You have to pay your rent?
I owe four weeks' rent at the present time.

1630. *Chairman.*] What do you pay?
Two shillings and ninepence a week, one room.

1631. What kind of shirts are they that you make?
Plain run ups; this is the kind of shirt (*producing a shirt*).

1632. You have to send for the goods, and send them back again?
Yes, I have to go for them and take them back.

1633. How long have you been in this business?
Six years.

1634. Do you find any difference in the prices you get now from what you used to get?
Yes, we do not get near so much money as we used to get six years ago. Six years ago I used to get 1 *s.* 9 *d.* and 2 *s.* a dozen for them.

1635. Did you always work at this when your husband was in full work?
No, I did not work at this when my husband was in full work; it is only since he has been unfortunate in work that I have had to take to the machine.

1636. Who do you get your machine from?
Messrs. Singer and Company.

1637. Does it become your property after a time?
Yes; 7 *l.* 3 *s.* I have to pay.

1638. What happens if you get into arrears?
They will take it away from me; I am in arrears now at the present time with my machine.

1639. If you are a certain time in arrears you lose all that you have paid upon it?
Yes.

1640. Has that ever happened to you?
Yes.

1641. Lord *Monkswell.*] How many hours a day do you work?
I begin between seven and eight in the morning, and I have to work sometimes till 11 at night; I have to attend to the children.

1642. But how many hours do you suppose you work after deducting those interruptions?
Twelve hours.

1643. Have you no work except the machine?
No, except the trimmings work.

1644. All your work on the shirts is done by machine?
Yes.

1645. Do you work on Sunday?
No; my husband would not allow me to touch the machine on Sunday.

1646. Lord *Rothschild.*] He does nothing?
Only in the docks, a day or two now and then; he works in the South West India Docks.

1647. *Chairman.*] Have you any body working with you?
No.

1648. Do you know many people engaged in the same business?
No, I do not know many; I do not associate with many people.

1649. You do not know whether many of them earn more than you or less than you?
Yes, some earn more than me.

1650. It depends upon their skill, I suppose?
Yes; I am working now for Mr. Munro, and I am getting a little more for shirts now; he is able to pay me 1 *s.* and 1 *s.* 2 *d.* a dozen for them.

1651. Since when have you been working for Mr. Munro?
Five weeks.

1652. Earl of *Onslow.*] Is there any part of the sewing of a shirt that cannot be done by machinery?
No, I do it all by machinery.

1653. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Are the button holes done by machinery?
I do not do anything with the buttonholes; there is another class of finisher to that.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

24th April 1888.

THE REV. JAMES MUNRO, having been re-called, is further Examined, as follows:

1654. *Chairman.*] I ASKED Mrs. Hayes whether it was not possible to do the work that she was doing by means of a sewing machine, and she said, yes, it could be done; you want to make some remark about that?

She misunderstood your question. There is no finishing that can be done by machinery, because it is all hand sewing that is required for that purpose.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MRS. HAYES, having been re-called, is further Examined, as follows:

1655. *Chairman.*] PERHAPS you did not quite understand my question just now. What I wanted to know was, whether the work you do without a machine could not be done with a machine?

My work, of course is, that I have to put buttons and all that kind of thing on; of course I have to finish.

1656. You mean, if I understand you, that part of the work which you do might be done by machine, and that some of it could not be done by machine. I want to know whether if you had a sewing machine you could do all of your work by means of that sewing machine?

No, I could not put buttons on by a machine.

1657. But you could do some of the work by sewing machine?

Not me; I do not understand the machine at all.

1658. But could the work be done by a sewing machine; do other people do the same kind of work as you do with a sewing machine?

No, not that I am aware of.

1659. Do you mean none of what is called finishing can be done by the sewing machine?

No, not that I am aware of.

1660. Lord *Thring.*] What do you do besides the buttonholes; what do you do to the trousers?

I have to put band linings on; we have to soap all those bottoms (*pointing*), likewise soap the seams, then take and sew this lining on to this part of the trousers (*pointing*).

1661. Why could you not sew that lining on by a machine if you understood the machine?

I have never had any; I have never done any; it is felled on with a needle; I do fell them on with a needle.

1662. And you do not understand the machine?

No, I do not understand the machine at all. It is all the tops that we have to do, all that sort (*pointing to a pair of trousers*).

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

24th April 1888.

MRS. FRANCES AMELIA LIDDLE, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

1663. *Chairman.*] WHERE do you live?
No. 32, Cordelia-street, Poplar.

1664. Are you married?
Yes.

1665. Is your husband employed in any way?
No; he is away in a hospital.

1666. What is his business?
Ship's clerk by trade.

1667. What is a ship's clerk?
Tallying the cargoes of the ships.

1668. When was he last in work?
He has only done one day's work this year.

1669. Was that on account of ill-health?
Yes.

1670. Not on account of the difficulty of getting work?
Yes, the work has been very slack; there has been no work for him.

1671. You are a shirt machinist?
Yes.

1672. Have you only taken to that since your husband was unable to get work?
Yes.

1673. You did not work in that way before?
No.

1674. How long have you been at that work?
I started last Christmas on the shirt work.

1675. You work with a sewing machine?
Yes.

1676. I suppose you get your sewing machine from a company, and pay so much for the use of it?
Yes, 2*s.* 6*d.* a week.

1677. What do you get for your work?
I have been having 7*d.*, 8*d.*, and 9*d.* a dozen for common work.

1678. What makes the difference in price, do you know at all; why do you get 9*d.* for some and 7*d.* for others?
Some have more work in them.

1679. It depends upon the description of the shirt?
Yes.

1680. How many shirts do you make in a day?
I have done a dozen-and-a-half a day of sevenpenny shirts.

1681. And how long do you have to work for that?
From early in the morning until late at night. I have sat until twelve and one at night to do a dozen-and-a-half; the children have been so tiresome and so cross that I have had to keep leaving off to attend to them.

1682. How much have you made in the week?
I have earned 5*s.*, 6*s.*, and 7*s.* a week.

1683. And

1683. And out of that you have to pay 2*s.* 6*d.* for the machine?
Yes, and 3*s.* rent.

1684. And trimmings, how much?
Ninepence for cottons. The rest I have to live on. I have a mother to assist me a little.

1685. Lord *Thring.*] Will you be able to make more money when you have had more practice?
Yes.

1686. How much more do you think you will be able to make?
If I could have the little baby put at a home, and had my work regular every day, I could earn 12*s.* a week.

1687. But when you have had more practice you will be able to earn more, will you not?
Yes.

1688. Do you know what the earnings are of the best machine workers?
I have been having work from the mission hall, Mr. Munro, at 1*s.* 2*d.* and 1*s.* 1*d.* a dozen; that is far better paid than what I had been having before.

1689. The best possible worker you know of, how much does she earn?
I do not know of anyone who does the same work as myself; there is only a young person that I know that does the same work as myself.

1690. Lord *Rothschild.*] I suppose the workers who work better than you, do not do the same kind of work, but work a better class of work?
Of course there are different classes of work that I have not done.

1691. The better class of work is paid better?
I believe so.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MRS. SUSAN ATTEWELL is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

1692. *Chairman.*] ARE you a shirt machinist?
Yes.

1693. How long have you been at it?
About a year and five months now.

1694. What made you take to it?
Because my husband was out of work.

1695. What was his trade.
Dock labourer.

1696. Has he had no work for the last year and five months?
He has not done anything all the winter till this last three weeks, and on Saturday he met with an accident.

1697. He earned nothing all the winter?
He has not done more than six weeks' work all through the winter.

1698. He has not been able to get work; is that what you mean?
He has not been able to get work; there has not been any.

1699. On Saturday he had an accident?
Yes, a bale of jute fell on his foot.

1700. Did you take to this business before your husband was unable to get work?
Yes.

1701. What do you get?
I get 7 *d.*, 8 *d.*, and 9 *d.* a dozen; perchance we have 10 *d.*, but that is very heavy work.

1702. How many can you make?
Of 7 *d.* work I could manage two dozen a day, and sometimes of 8 *d.* work, when I work very hard; but if we have better work we cannot do more than a dozen and a half, and then I work from seven in the morning until eight o'clock at night. I have three children to find bread for; when my husband is not at work, of course I have to find bread for them.

1703. Have you anybody to help you with the work?
No.

1704. You work entirely alone?
Yes.

1705. Is your husband in the hospital?
No, he is not bad enough to be in a hospital; he went to have his foot bound; he is not able to go out and get to work.

1706. Lord *Rothschild.*] When he is at work what does he earn?
Three shillings and fourpence a day, and in the winter months it is only 2 *s.* 11 *d.* from November till March; it depends on the length of the daylight.

1707. *Chairman.*] What do you pay for your rent?
Three shillings.

1708. And what for the machine?
I pay 1 *s.* 6 *d.* a week; I have it from Bradbury's.

1709. Some other witnesses pay 2 *s.* 6 *d.* for theirs?
Yes, they do, to Singer.

1710. Is it the same kind of machine?
It is after the same make; it is a different patent.

1711. Can you get through as much work with the machine that you pay 1 *s.* 6 *d.* for, as others can with a machine that they pay 2 *s.* 6 *d.* for?
Decidedly.

1712. That is 3 *s.* and 1 *s.* 6 *d.*; and you have to find your trimmings?
Cotton, according to what I earn; if I earn 5 *s.*, it costs about 6 *d.* out of that for cotton; if I earn 7 *s.* 6 *d.* it costs me, perhaps, 3 *d.* more.

1713. What do you clear in a week; what have you left to live upon?
Sometimes I have not more than 3 *s.*; I do not average more than about 3 *s.* By the time I have paid my rent and firing, I do not reckon I have more than 6 *d.* a day to find bread for the children.

1714. What food do you have?
A bit of bread and butter and a cup of tea; very often we have to go till evening till I get the money, when I take the work in and get paid for it.

1715. They pay you the moment you take it in?
When you take it in, as a rule, the work is paid for.

1716. Whom do you work for?
Mr. Develley.

1717. Is that far from where you live?
No, 10 minutes' walk.

1718. Do you go there in the morning?
Yes; we cannot go in after two, and then again from seven till nine in th evening.

1719. When do you take back the work; at night?
Yes.

1720. And

1720. And then you fetch the work for the next day?
Yes.

1721. Is your husband getting any support whatever?
No, none whatever.

1722. Lord *Thring.*] You support your husband and your children?
Yes, we are obliged to do the best we can.

1723. When your husband was at full work, did you work at shirt-making?
No.

1724. When he is at full work again shall you go on working at shirt-making?
Yes, I should do a little, to clear the debt he has got in while out of work.

1725. Do any people working in the same trade as yourself get higher prices?
Some of them get 1 *s.* 6 *d.* a dozen, but you cannot do so much of that work; you earn no more; you cannot do more than eight or nine shirts a day if you have 1 *s.* 6 *d.*; there is a deal more work in them.

1726. Do you consider yourself a very skilful workwomen?
I can go through as many as most of them; there are not many go through more without they work more hours.

1727. Lord *Sandhurst.*] You said you paid 3 *s.* for your rent?
Yes.

1728. Have you two rooms?
I have two back rooms.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mrs. ELIZA GLAZIER, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

1729. *Chairman.*] Do you finish shirts?
Yes.

1730. What does finishing a shirt mean; what do you do?
Make the button-holes, sew the buttons on, and do the button-hole tackings.

1731. That is all done by hand, without the machine?
Yes.

1732. How much a dozen do you get for that?
Threepence.

1733. And how many dozen can you do in a day?
About a dozen or a dozen and a-half, because my eyes are very bad. I have to wear glasses.

1734. I suppose others in the same business can do a great deal more?
That I cannot say.

1735. You would be able to do more if your eyes were not bad?
I might be able to do a little more, but the button-holes take a long while to do.

1736. You only make a dozen and a-half, at 3 *d.* a dozen, in the day?
Yes.

1737. Then you can only earn 4½ *d.* in a day?
Yes.

1738. Do you have to find any materials, any trimmings, cotton?
Only the cotton.

1739. What rent have you to pay?
Two shillings and sixpence a week.

1740. What kind of food do you have?
Very bad indeed; I cannot get much. My husband is a dock labourer, and sometimes he does not earn a farthing for a fortnight or three weeks together, and of course he is an old man now, and they do not employ him so much as the younger ones; they will take younger ones before they take him. He is in his 67th year, and of course he is an old man now.

1741. Has he got work now?
No; he has to go to the dock every day to see whether he can get work or not; it is very seldom he gets any.

1742. About how often can he get work?
About twice or three times a week, and if he can, it is only 2 *s.* at a time.

1743. He earns on an average about 4 *s.* a week?
Yes, and sometimes nothing at all.

1744. How long has that been going on?
It has been these two years. You see that at the Royal Albert Dock the work is very bad indeed to what it used to be.

1745. Have you any children?
I have two.

1746. You and your husband between you can earn something between 7 *s.* and 8 *s.* per week?
Yes, that is the most we do have.

1747. Your rent is 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a week?
Yes.

1748. How long have been a shirt finisher?
Nearly four years.

1749. Could you earn any more four years ago than you do now?
No, I earned less then than I do now, because there was not so much work then as there is now.

1750. You could not get so much work then?
No.

1751. Do you get all the work now that you could do?
No. I could not do more than a couple of dozen; if I did more I should suffer, because my eyes are so bad.

1752. Do you get the work from the shop?
Yes.

1753. After it has left the hands of the machinist?
Yes.

1754. Then it comes to you, and you finish it?
Yes.

1755. Earl of *Limerick.*] Were your eyes better when you first commenced the work?
Yes.

1756. Has the work affected your eyes?
Wearing the glasses so long at a time, I believe; I always had good eyes before.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

24th April 1888.

MR. LEWIS LYONS is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

1757. *Chairman.*] WHAT is your business?
Tailor's machinist.

1758. Are you working at that business now?
Yes.

1759. Are you connected also with the press in any way?
I write letters and articles on the subject.

1760. On the subject of the sweating system?
Yes.

1761. In what newspapers?
In the "Star," "Reynolds'," "Jewish World," "East London Observer." All these papers have helped to create public opinion on the subject, especially the "Jewish World" has. Its columns were open during the last three years for the discussion on the subject.

1762. Have you been working at your trade all the time also?
Yes, excepting when I had my own paper; I had my own monthly journal for eight months, called the "Anti Sweater," and part of that time I was working as well, and the money that I had earned I spent on the journal.

1763. How long did you run it?
There were eight numbers of the "Anti Sweater." In the last number I adopted the plan of two Hebrew columns, in order that the workers might understand what the system is, and so write, or send this copy over to their friends at home to explain to them the hardships which they have to undergo, and try to keep them away from this country. Of course it was very much appreciated, but unfortunately the paper dropped for want of funds.

1764. How did you get the money to start the paper?
The first number I started without money, it was trusted to me. The second number was paid for by a friend, I do not wish to mention the name; and the remaining numbers I paid for out of my earnings.

1765. Do you mean that you published six numbers of the paper out of your own earnings?
Yes; I owe money of course, now, for printing and stationery, and so forth.

1766. You received no support from any society?
No support in funds, with the exception of buying copies. Of course the paper did not have a very large circulation, but during the time it had a circulation, it had a great deal of effect, especially with the stick makers. It helped to form a society, and likewise it helped to take off a certain sum which the employers charged for sums which they lent to them during their work days. For instance, if a man who is hard up has done his day's work on Monday, or Tuesday, and wants a loan of a shilling or two, the employer charges him at the end of the week 2*d.*, and some of them 3*d.* off every shilling, which he deducts. The article which appeared in my journal created a public opinion among the stick makers, and they formed a society, and the employers got somewhat frightened. I do not suppose that they were frightened by the article, but by the association which was formed, and they took off that 3*d.* which they had deducted out of every shilling; some of them continue to do so now.

1767. Are you a native of this country?
Yes.

1768. Earl of *Limerick.*] How long is the loan for?
Only for a week; it is deducted at the end of the week off the wages.

1769. *Chairman.*] Have you always worked in the same trade?
Yes, ever since I was 11 years old.

1770. Perhaps you would give the Committee an account of the sweating system as applied to the tailoring trade, which you are engaged in?
I shall lay before your Lordships the facts connected with this trade, but I should like to supplement it with a very few remarks, because I consider that the sweating system is not a system of to-day, and I am prepared to prove that this system has been in existence for the last 40 or 50 years; I have documents with me which will show that. Consequently the idea that foreign pauper immigration has created the sweating system is not altogether correct, though I am not altogether favourable to the large numbers of foreign paupers, because I think they create a misery unto themselves, and if they could only be kept away, by the means which I would suggest, it would be far better for themselves, because I know of cases where men come over here and actually starve, and when I ask them the question, "Would you like to go back they tell me, yes, and they are very sorry they have come here; but they told me that the letters that had been printed and sent over from here telling them how easy the work over here was had induced them to come here. Consequently the great influx of foreigners at the present time has not created the sweating system, but the sweating system has been created by the men who wanted to make capital out of these poor people. Forty or 50 years ago the victims of the sweating system were Irish and English, and now the sweating system has extended to Jews at the same time, and I may say that the Jewish sweaters' victims work harder than the previous two.

1771. You are speaking of the East End of London all the time?
I am speaking generally.

1772. You had better confine yourself as much as possible to London, and to the East End of London, as far as you can, because that is the subject of the inquiry of the Committee?
And I should like to give your Lordships the definition of a sweater before I proceed, in order to show how labour has been so much divided, and divided for profit. The definition of a sweater is this: the word sweat derives its origin from the Anglo-Saxon swat, and means the separation or extraction of labour or toil from others for one's own benefit. Any person who employs others to extract from them surplus labour without compensation is a sweater. A middle-man sweater is a person who acts as a contractor for labour for another man. The position becomes somewhat aggravated when the middleman sweater employs the labour himself at his own house for the purpose of extracting a double quantity of labour, either by lowering wages, or work longer hours. Further, a sweater is a person who subdivides an industry into several branches, also by not teaching an apprentice or other person learning a trade all the details connected with such industry. A sweater is a person who practices a subdivision of labour for his own private ends. Now, my Lords, you will find that this definition speaks of a sweater as subdividing labour. The subdivisions of labour in the tailoring trade would be about 25, and I would just proceed to explain. I heard one witness say that the subdivisions in our trade were only three, but I am going to show that there are 25; this is done in order that the persons who do a particular branch of industry should not know the value of the labour for which he pays the other person who does the other part of an industry; consequently the workers are left in ignorance of what the actual price for the whole garment would be. First of all there are the coats and vests and trousers; that is three. Take the coats first; they are again subdivided into a baster, presser, machine-hand for each machine, under-presser, button-holer, and a girl who does such things as sewing on hangers and pulling out bastes. The vests are again subdivided into machine and felling; a waistcoat machine-hand could not be a coat machine-hand, so you see that the labour is subdivided there again. Now we come to the trousers; a machine-hand finisher, a baster, a presser, and under-presser. It is a remarkable thing how these people are unacquainted with the whole of the trade; the person who presses

presses off a pair of trousers could not press off a coat, and the person who presses a coat could not press off a waistcoat, but the one who presses a waistcoat could not press off a coat. So the labour is so much subdivided that the worker in the coat trade does not know the actual price given for the whole garment, unless he is made acquainted with it. Now, in the factories the labour is divided much more than they are in a sweater's den, because for suits you have the braiders, and a braider could not do any other part of the machine work, such as putting in pockets. You have another class of machine-hand who do the stitch work, but not bound work. I should like to mention that, in order to become a practical machinist, one must learn the trade for about four or five years. You see the labour is so much divided that one does not know the other particular part of the branch; so much so, that if a machine-hand or a presser of a sweater should happen to stop away the other hands would have to leave off work. It is also done, again, for this purpose, that when a man or a woman is put to a particular branch of the work she becomes a specialist in that particular branch, and his or her whole mind is concentrated upon that particular branch of the work; consequently, he or she would turn out a double quantity of that particular class of work if they stick to it, instead of going from one branch of the work to the other. You see they do this from the more economical point of view; that is our great objection. If the labour was not so much subdivided there would not be half the evils connected with the sweating system. I have written out a statement, which I will read, as to the arising of the middleman sweater. My definition gave the sweater as the man who has the capital, but does not do the work himself, and in most cases the large manufacturers belonging to our trade do not understand the making a garment at all, as they used to in the 12th and 13th centuries, when the old City Guilds were in existence. A man with capital now invests his money in order to get some profit from the actual workers. He employs a manager, this manager gives the work out to a middleman (sometimes he understands the work, sometimes he does not), who advertises for men who can do the work, and the men who apply for this work are the sweaters. I should like to mention that the largest number of sweaters are not Jews; of course, in the East End they are, but if you take it generally, they are not.

1773. When you speak of sweaters, do you mean the masters or the men?

I mean the masters; the men are not sweaters, the men are sweatees. The master is the middleman sweater, but the man with the capital, who employs the sweatee, is a sweater himself.

1774. Lord *Clinton.*] Are you applying this to the tailoring trade, or to all trades?

My definition applies to all trades: bootmaking, shirtmaking, tailoring, and all the trades round. Your Lordships would perhaps like to have explained the rise of a sweater, and then I will go on to show the present legislation to arrest this. I will also show the number of societies that are in existence at the present time to try to arrest this evil. Then I will prove the failure of both; likewise, I will point out my own suggestions, which I consider would be effectual.

1775. Earl of *Onslow.*] Do you mean trade unions, or societies like those we have had mentioned?

I mean trades unions. The capital required to start a sweating shop is very insignificant. He first selects a room in his house, and then goes to a friend, asking for a loan of a garment, say a finished coat, as a sample, to take on a shop. The reason why he does this is because the man is only a specialist, such as a machinist, or presser; he is not able to make a garment right out by himself, but when he starts a sweating shop and collects the machine hands, pressers, and basters, and, when he becomes a master, not being able to make a coat himself, he goes to another man who has a coat already made, and asks him for the loan of that coat as a sample to take on a shop. A manager, or foreman, seeing this garment, asks him whether it is his own, and of course he says yes; the sample shown is a very good one, and on the recommendation

of the sample he gives him work. I do not know whether the foreman knows that he is not a tailor himself, but I know of two foremen who know that the very men who come to take on a shop are not tailors themselves, because, had they been they would not have degraded themselves to go and make a coat for 10 *d.* or 1 *s.*, such as is given out by Hollington and Company, one of the largest firms in the east of London.

1776. *Chairman*]. Is there no security required?

Yes; I am coming to that. I may mention that this place puts out the commonest work of all, and it is a most disgraceful thing that the public should be allowed to be deceived in that fashion. I should have brought samples with me of the particular kind of cloth which is made up into coats, but I assure your Lordships that the garments made out of this cloth do not last more than two or three weeks. Of course it is cheap; nevertheless the workmen are deceived by the inferior class of work. While I am on this subject I should suggest that a kind of clause should be put in, in some Act, the Adulteration Act, for instance, asking them not to make up such rubbish, because they are only deceiving the public; and in fact it becomes much dearer to the workman, because he has to buy four or five of these coats a year; otherwise, if they were good materials and workmanship, he would have to buy perhaps one, and it would help him in the same way. After taking on a shop the sweater gives security, and then receives work. His next move is to strike off a few bills, or to advertise for "hands," who are usually quickly forthcoming. With these he strikes a bargain for a daily wage, or a small amount for each garment made, in either case screwed down to the uttermost farthing, and allowing the sweater a tolerably good profit. A few gas-burners are knocked up; the two, three, or four wretched rooms of which the dilapidated house can boast are furnished with a few deal tables and chairs; each room is filled with from eight to ten persons, mostly girls, to whom indeed the sweater is rather partial, since they can do with less wages; the work is given out, the sewing machine strikes up its rattling noise, and another sweating shop is started somewhere in the streets right and left of Bethnal Green, Hackney-road, and Whitechapel-road, in Princes-street, Church-street, Brick-lane, or Hanbury-street, Spitalfields. But wherever the shop may be, the sanitary conditions are invariably bad. Starting with little or no capital, the sweater cannot afford to make his rooms fit for the use to which they have been put; consequently nine or ten people are crowded into a room barely fit for three persons. I think, with regard to the word to "sweat," I ought in fairness to the sweater to say that in many cases he works just as hard as we do, and it is because he has to work so hard that we have to work still harder; and it is on account of that alone that I am opposed to the system. We have nothing to do with the particular shop that gives him the work. If we were to go to the shop and say, "Let us work fewer hours," they would say, "I do not know you." So we have to strike against the very man we are employed by, though he works as hard as we do. The work being always continued till late at night, the three or four gas-jets may be found flaring in one room, a coke fire may be seen burning dimly in the wretched fire-place, sinks are untrapped, closets are without water, and altogether the sanitary conditions are abominable. In this matter the inspectors under the Factory Acts are powerless, sanitation remaining exclusively under local authority, whose functions are limited. I should like to point out to your Lordships the particular clause in the Factory Act, and then I will ask your Lordships also for the Metropolis Local Management Act of 1855; I will point out where the two powers clash; and between the two we suffer. The Rev. Charles Kingsley was a better prophet than most people thought when he gave utterance to the opinion that, large as the "sweater" and tailoring community generally was at that time, they would enormously increase in future years. This is accounted for by the short term of apprenticeship, as I explained before, by the middleman sweater, and likewise the manufacturer only teaching these girls for one month, and making them specialists in a particular branch of their work, in order to grind more profit out of them. I may also say that the great competition in the East End of London does not arise from the foreign pauper immigration chiefly, but from those towns where the

the clothing industry is carried on. I must travel into the provinces, because I have been there, and I know that in the provinces very few foreigners are engaged in the tailoring trade, chiefly girls who are taught for only one or two months, and the manufacturers there can go into the market much cheaper than the manufacturers in London; and consequently the manufacturers in London must try to reduce his price, and he does not care whether he be a man or a woman, but he wants the garments made at the cheapest; and it is not a question of foreign labour so much as it is cheap labour; and as they cannot get sufficient girls here to do that particular skilled work, as I will show later on, with a Singer's sewing machine, consequently they reduce our wages, and we suffer, not through foreign immigration so much, but on account of the competition in the provinces, where the manufacturers employ girls.

1777. Earl of *Onslow*.] Which are the principal places that employ these persons?

Liverpool, Manchester, Glasgow, Stroud, Bristol, and several other places, but chiefly females are employed there, and the manufacturers in London cut down our wages here, or make us work longer hours. The popular writer I have mentioned clearly foresaw that, with an increased population, there must ensue a correspondingly increased demand for clothing, which, in its turn, would result in an increased number of sweaters. But, good prophet as he was, the author of "Alton Locke" failed to see another cause altogether beyond the economic principle of demand and supply, which, slowly but surely, was tending to increase the number of wretched tailors and heartless sweaters. As I explained before, there are two reasons for a sweater arising; first, because he sees the amount of profit in some cases made by the employer, and, secondly, that he is treated so badly; that is to say, that the inhuman conduct, and the long hours and the small workshop, enough to stifle a person, made it so hard that he thinks he would rather work at home, and be his own master. Of course I should not object to his doing that himself, but, generally, he takes on one hand, two hands, or three hands, and does exactly the same thing as the previous employer. But he also cheapens labour by working himself; in this respect, that when he goes into the shop he must go into the shop where his employer goes to, or to another sweater's shop, He asks for work; it is not to the advantage of the manufacturer to give him that work unless he does it cheaper, because, he says, "I have got my men to work; if you can do it cheaper I will give it you." "Very well," he says, "I will work an hour longer; I have taken on a number of greeners." And at the place where I am working now a greener comes in at six o'clock in the morning and leaves off at 10 o'clock at night; he has been here six weeks; and I begin at seven o'clock in the morning and leave off at nine o'clock in the evening; though I get more wages than he does, in six months' time he will get nearly the same wages as I do, and I, as a workman, shall have to go and seek work elsewhere. What I shall suggest by-and-by is, that certain restrictions shall be placed on them. When an aged person (I am speaking of "greeners" now) is conveyed to a "sweating" shop and taught to make up cloth into a particular part of a garment, the sweater is too well alive to his own interests to teach the person the whole of the trade, as I have explained before. In a few days the embryo tailors are proficient in their work, and, in return for the merest pittance, are kept in close bondage, the sweater meanwhile pocketing, in addition to his ordinary large profits, the difference between the price he pays these hapless people and that which he would have paid, in the usual way, to any of the workmen for whom he might have advertised. And to this bondage they have to submit with the best possible grace, since, being able only to do one part of a garment, or one particular portion of work, they are handicapped in their efforts to obtain other employment. If, however, as they often do, they manage to learn, by fair means or by foul, the whole of their trade (and it is very seldom), then, by dint of pinching and starving themselves to the utmost limits, they manage to scrape together sufficient to start a sweating establishment of their own, and thus the ranks of sweaters, I had almost said slave-owners, are continually increased. Knowing, by experience, the amount of work which their *employées* can be made to do,

and the hardships to which they have perforce to submit, their hearts are as callous as those of their late employers. But, even when the *employée* is kept at one particular kind of work throughout the whole of his apprenticeship, as the sweater delights to call it, yet he can often manage to become a sweater. By scraping and saving, he may get sufficient capital to start a shop (that is about 2 *l.*), and, when the time comes when he must look for "orders," he can usually get a sample of a garment from another sweater, which, by passing off at the clothing establishment as being of his own make, may secure him the desired orders. Yet, whether the ignorant foreigner or the skilled journeyman starts as sweater, there is still left to suffer, from the greed of the others, a class the least able to bear the hardships inflicted upon them; girls and women. Receiving money that scarce can be called wages, so miserably small is it as compared with the work they do (working from 10 to 15 hours a day in rooms devoid of the most simple sanitary arrangements), their daily life is something not far short of martyrdom. From what I have already shown, it will be evident then that the ranks of the sweaters are continually swelling, and they will continue to do so unless some restrictions, which I will suggest by-and-bye are placed on them. From this there can be but one result; a result that is, and has for long been, making itself felt. Competition necessarily cheapens labour; but the sweaters are by no means disposed to suffer in their own pockets from lower prices. Instead of contenting themselves with a decrease in profits, which they could very well afford, they make their hands work longer and for less pay. Of course I hold very strong opinions on the question of capital and labour. Profit, fairly earned and fairly paid for, is right enough; but profits, and exorbitant profits as I shall prove, made by a system of cruel slavery and unjust tyranny, calls for the censure of all honourable and right dealing men. To begin with, I will now just give you a descriptive account of the people working in a sweater's den.

1778. *Chairman.*] From your own personal experience?

Yes; I have had about 14 years' experience in sweaters' dens.

1779. What you are going to describe to the Committee you have seen yourself?

I have worked in them; I am one of the victims myself. To begin with, I may state, in the first place, that although many sweating establishments contain as many as from 100 to 200 hands (when I say sweating establishments I mean factories; I do not know whether the people call it a factory; to me it is really a workshop, or I would rather describe it as a modern workhouse; if your Lordships could only obtain admission to any of these places you would see the hardships these people have to undergo; a workshop, according to my estimation, is where there are persons, whether it is one or two persons, employed for profit for another man). The average number of hands employed in the sweating shops of the East End is 20. For 20 hands thus employed there is an average of 40 garments per day to be made, each paying 3 *s.* I give the lowest figure paid as affording some satisfaction at least to the over-sensitive sweater. I give 3 *s.*; though I have said that in the majority of cases 7 *d.* and 1 *s.* are paid for garments, yet there are garments made for 5 *s.*, 10 *s.*, and 8 *s.* Perhaps your Lordships would think that this is the best class work; it is, but this is sent down into the sweater's den and made for the same wages as are paid to these men for making up the low class of goods, and the difference between the prices is pocketed by the sweater. The income then for these 40 garments would mean about 6 *l.* per day. Now coming to the question of expenditure, I must first enumerate two good machinists, whose average wages per day of 14 hours is 6 *s.* each. It was said by a witness, Mr. Stephany I think, that they get 8 *s.* and 9 *s.* a-day. There may be one or two who get that; but when you come to consider that they are only at work for two or three days in the week, and that they only have two or three months' work during the year, I should like to know whether that is 8 *s.* a-day. Of course the time I am not working I must eat, and pay for eating, sleeping, &c.; what I am earning one day consequently I must use for the others; that is not 8 *s.* or 9 *s.* a-day.

1779. Earl

1779. Earl of *Onslow*.] How much is it?

If there are two or three days in the week, and I get 8*s*., as Mr. Stephany says some of them do, I get now 7 *s*. for 14 hours; by a working day I mean 10½ hours, the same as a girl would work; that is not even 7*s*. a day.

1780. *Chairman*.] You are describing the class of people who work in a sweater's den?

Yes. I must first enumerate two good machinists, whose average wages per day of 14 hours is 6*s*. each. These are probably about the highest paid workers in the employ of the sweater, in consideration of their work requiring slightly more skill. Then there are three other "plain" machinists, doing the hardest part of the day's work, who, working for the same number of hours, are rewarded with the handsome sum of 2*s*. each. Now although the "plain" machinists are not so skilled as the good ones, yet they are made to work much harder, because more work is put on to them, as there is more plain work to be done by a good machinist.

1781. Will you explain the terms?

Plain work is plain sewing of seams. I have brought some few goods here to show the number of pieces and the mode of working. These (*pointing*) are straight seams; these are pockets; pockets are put in by the skilled machinist, while the straight seams are done by the plain machinist. This seam and that seam of the sleeve (*pointing*) are done by the plain machinist; the cuff is done by the "good" machinist. The good machinist has to sew it in the arm-hole; that is his work; though the plain seaming is much harder than this, yet she or he receives a much lower sum for doing the hardest part of the work. That is on account of not having a long term of apprenticeship and being unacquainted with the skilled part of the work. Next in the list come a couple of "pressers." Here, again, there is a woeful discrepancy in the wages earned, for while one "presser," for a day of 15 hours, gets 6*s*. (and I may mention that the "presser" does work an hour longer than the machinist or "baster," though there is no necessity for him to do so; but under the present circumstances the machine-hand is off about 9 o'clock, and he finishes the last garment, or nearly so. Now the "presser" cannot press off the garment at the same time that the machine-hand has got it in hand; so consequently the "presser" has to wait while the machine-hand is finishing, though there is no necessity for this: the sweater makes him work an hour longer for the same money); the other, the under-presser, probably because he has to work harder, for I am unable to see any other reason, gets a less sum, is in receipt of the liberal wage of 1*s*. per day, and he again has to work much harder than the more skilled "presser;" it is because he has not served his term of apprenticeship; I would term a term of apprenticeship four or five years; so he is unable to do that skilled part of the pressing, and consequently has not that amount of skill that the other one has; he has to work much harder, because he has to be submissive to the employer; and he would say to him, "If you do not like it, go; I can get another man that I can teach in a month, and he will do the same work as yourself;" and this man is bound to submit to these hardships, and work for a less sum until he becomes proficient from seeing the other presser doing that skilled part; I may mention that the workmen among themselves are very generous to each other; they will show each other how to do their work while the sweater is looking away; but while the sweater is looking on he will not allow any person to show others because he says, "You are wasting my time." The "baster" stands next with 6*s*. per day, and then come three hands, usually girls, with 10*s*. per week each, or 1*s*. 8*d*. for a day's work of 13 hours. In addition, there are three apprentices, who, as a consideration for a hard day's work, are awarded with 4*d*., their standing wage being 2*s*. per week. Next come the button-holers, who are engaged on piece-work, and receive one halfpenny for every button-hole worked. There being usually four button-holes in each garment, the 40 garments given out bring up their earnings to 6*s*. 8*d*. per day. The trimmings generally average 2*s*. per day; the rent of the rooms (I am only talking about the work-shop; some of the sweaters occupy four or five rooms themselves, but I cannot see

 why

why the workers should pay for what the sweater occupies for himself) runs (and this is a liberal calculation) to 2 *s.* 10½ *d.*, the fire and gas necessitate another 2 *s.*, while the barrow used for the conveyance of the work to the clothing establishment involves an outlay of 2 *d.* This means a total; but I must stop. I had almost forgotten to give the sweater credit for an extraordinary amount of liberality. You heard the first witness state that the sweater treats his hands to tea and coffee. Now it is only fair, after the censure I have dealt out, that I should mention the fact that the sweater is a generous man. He treats his hands to tea and coffee! Heavens! The veriest cur would turn in disgust from the vile mixture (it is not tea and coffee) upon which the sweater bestows the libel of tea and coffee. A statist would thoroughly ponder over the mysterious mixture before he would venture to fix any value upon the horrible stuff. Not being a statist, I give it, without compunction, the value of 4 *d.*, and leave the "sweater" to chuckle over the threepennyworth extra of generosity with which he has been accredited. Reckoning all these items together, I bring the total expenditure to 2 *l.* 11 *s.* -½ *d.*; and even then the sweater must give me credit for dealing with him in a very liberal manner. Subtracting this from the 6 *l.* earned on the 40 garments, I find the sweater pocketing at the end of each day the total profit of 3 *l.* 8 *s.* 11½ *d.* What must be the profits of those sweaters who employ 10 times as many hands, I leave your Lordships to guess. The figures mentioned seem incredible, and will doubtless be warmly disputed; I can only repeat that I have given the most liberal calculation, and I give them on my own authority, having spent nearly a lifetime among the sweaters, and made it my special business to master the intricacies of the sweater's income and expenditure. I am quite prepared to admit that this enormous profit is due to the large increase in the number of tailors and tailoresses, and the consequent competition for work and the cutting down of the wages. We bestow the name of "tailors and tailoresses" upon them, but you could not call a person a tailor or tailoress unless they are completely so. If a person only knows a machine or how to press, he is only a divisionalist, and what your Lordships could do is to put such restrictions as I may suggest later, to make these persons practical tailors, and more independent of their employers. In this connection, too, it might be interesting to remark that whereas in 1841 there were 6,142 tailors and tailoresses in England and Wales, and 3,252 in London alone, their number was, according to the last Census Returns (for 1881) in England and Wales, 52,980, while in the metropolis it is calculated that in the present year there are as many as 20,000 tailors and tailoresses.

1782. How are these calculated; by whom?
By the Census Returns.

1783. The last Census?
The 1881 Census Returns. I have taken the Census Returns from 1881.

1784. Earl of *Onslow.*] I suppose everybody who works in a tailor's shop, or works at tailoring, would be returned in the Census as a tailor?
Yes, though he was only a divisionalist.

1785. In the figures you have just mentioned he would be so treated?
Yes. At the same time, these figures are conclusive in their testimony as to the tyranny and over-reaching of the sweaters. They censure in unmistakeable terms the conduct of the sweatees; not men, who, in the face of the thousands of hapless beings wearing their lives out for the merest pittance, yet manage to screw out of every 20 of tailors and tailoresses a profit of 3 *l.* 10 *s.* per day. These are the middlemen sweaters who get this profit. And these sweaters will take any room for a workshop, and they will make a workshop in any place; sometimes it is in the backyard, and if there is yard enough, they will ask the landlord to build a kind of a workshop, and the landlord consents to it and charges them 4 *s.* or 5 *s.* a week extra. In Plumber's-row, for instance, there is a row of houses; I remember the time when there were large yards there. The landlord, by the way (I do not care to shelter any one, whether it is against me or for me), is a member of my own nationality; he was induced

to

to build a large number of these workshops, and he charges them 4 *s.* or 5 *s.* a week; not that they should pay off the cost of the building, but continually. I should not so much object if he charged them the amount paid for building those workshops besides his rent, but instead of that he charges them this continually; there is no end of paying.

1786. I suppose you assume that the rent of those is considerably more than the interest on the outlay?

Exactly so. The sanitation, as I explained, is very bad. There has been a certain clause inserted in the Factory Act regulating the number of hours which says, that should a sweater require to work over-time, he should write out a notice from a book, called No. 40, supplied to him. Waterlow supplies these books at the rate of 6 *d.* Now I will just point out to your Lordships the manner in which these sweaters evade the Act; and I have pointed this out to Mr. Lakeman over and over again. I may say that Mr. Lakeman and the very few inspectors under him, work very hard, and have been working very hard lately, but there is no machinery at the back of them; and if you put on a dozen more inspectors at the East End, it would have no result, because they have no machinery to work with.

1787. What do you mean by "no machinery?"

I mean being armed with an Act that would give them more power. One of the most deplorable features in connection with the sweating system, perhaps the most deplorable, is the gross disregard by the sweater of all sanitary laws; his utter indifference to the demands of common decency. Without exception, the dens of the sweaters are the most filthy, poisonous, soul-and-body killing places imaginable. I know, in many cases, that persons become consumptive, as I will prove later on from medical evidence, on account of the insufficient oxygen breathed by the workers; they must necessarily become consumptive, and I think it is a danger to society, and it is a disgrace to England itself, that a body of workers should be consumptive where any such thing could be easily altered.

1788. *Chairman.*] Will you give the Committee details of the sanitary arrangements of a sweater's den with which you are acquainted?

There is one w. c. for all the workers; there are about 14; besides that, the sweater lets out two rooms to families, consisting of eight or 10 persons altogether it might be 22; there is only one w. c. for both males and females of the workshop, also for the tenants. I had a conversation with the sanitary inspector of St. George's, and I complained to him about it, and I pointed out the Public Health Act to him, and he showed me that it does not apply to London but only to rural and urban districts. I should like to see a clause that it should apply to London; that we should have two w. c.'s for males and females in workshops. The sanitary inspector of St. George's tells me that the medical officer of St. George's says, that one w. c. is quite sufficient for 20 persons in a house, so that he has nothing to do with whether it is males or females, as long as there are no more than 20 persons; but there are places where there are more than 20, but they will not have two w. c.'s, for this reason, because when a sanitary inspector, on the application of the medical officer, goes to the sweater and says, "I want you to make two w. c.'s, you have got more than 20 persons in the house," "Very well," he replies, "I cannot make another w. c," or "my landlord will not; I will reduce my hands" He reduces his hands while he is slack in work; that will bring it within the limits of the medical officer's statement, 20; but as soon as he begins to get busy he will put in his workshop another two or another four, so you see there is no actual guide as to these 20 at all I should certainly force them to have two or three of these w. c.'s, whether there are 20 or not 20, but where there are males and females working together in one workshop there should be w. c.'s for them separately, and also a w. c. for the tenants as well. The decency is of course very bad when there is a female going to the w. c. and a male also wants to use the same compartment at the same time; the female has to pass through the men and the men know where these females are going to, and consequently there

are jokes passed by these men, which the girls naturally do not like; and the girls become acquainted with these jokes by-and-by, and of course I leave your Lordships to guess what follows from the girls hearing such remarks as these. These things must be explained to your Lordships, because I believe this inquiry is for the purpose of having everything explained to your Lordships to consider these things, and this is a very important point which I wish to lay stress on. At least, if we cannot get anything else, let us have a sanitary workshop, and have a little common decency about it. I should like to describe my workshop. The workshop I am working in is in the yard, a place built in what was previously a yard; now it is a workshop. There are three machines in work, one fireplace, and eight or nine gaslights. There is a skylight also, but when the windows are broken in the skylight it is covered with pieces of rag, so when it is raining, the same as it was yesterday, we are treated to a free bath. If we say, "Look here, the rain is coming in, I cannot work," the sweater will say, "If you cannot work go home;" but a workman cannot afford to go home, he wants to get his living.

1789. How many of you are working there?

Fourteen or 15 altogether, sometimes less, sometimes more, it all depends upon the work as it comes in.

1790. How large is the room?

It will be about nine feet square. They are closely packed. The skylight cannot be opened because the string is broken; they will not trouble to have new strings put on in order that we may have a bit of fresh air. The door is also closed at night because it is too draughty to have the whole of the doors open; besides, it will blow a lot of work off the table. Just imagine that; it means 14 or 15 persons working in a room nine feet square, a coke fire in the fireplace, and gas being thrown off, and eight or nine gaslights burning, besides the breathing of the workers themselves. I have quite sufficiently described that particular kind of workshop, and I can only say we are closely packed. I will show later on that a person should not work in a workshop unless he has nine square feet space for himself, and can breathe 400 cubic feet of air. I will also point out from the Factory Inspector's Report the cubic feet of air breathed by those persons; in some cases it is 130. There is more cubic feet space allowed in a prison and in hospitals. Besides, in a workshop, I consider that there should be more cubic feet allowed than in a prison or a hospital, as the Reverend Ward Beecher pointed out some time ago. I will now proceed to show how the sweaters evade the Factory Act, by a trick on this book, No. 40. I suggested an alteration to Mr. Lakeman, but he has no power himself; he is simply an inspector, and has no voice in the legislation. I am willing to admit that this result is due as much to the ignorance of the sweater (some sweaters are ignorant of the Act itself) as to the selfish greed of the landlord; but whether the fault lies with the landlord or the sweater the result is the same; the workpeople are the sufferers. In nine cases out of ten most of the window panes are broken and filled up with canvas. Under these circumstances ventilation is a matter of impossibility. The light being excluded to a large extent by the canvas, the gas is kept burning for the greater part of the 15 or 16 hours, the wind finds its way through the apertures; a coke fire is kept burning (I have already given an account of a sweater's den, because your Lordships asked me to explain one), and thus we have a condition of things essentially favourable to a speedy contraction of lung or heart disease. The probability is too that there is a broken skylight in the room, by which the workpeople are often treated to a free shower-bath. I should like to mention that for my work, such as I will describe later on, for working Singer's sewing machine, you require plenty of light, especially for the needle. I have had two of my fingers off on account of insufficient light, and light, I think, ought to be provided for the protection of the workers. I should like to bring a machine here just to describe it, because it is necessary that it should be described (*a sewing machine was brought*). This is a Singer's sewing machine, the latest improvement, for both males and females. A few years ago that was one of the heaviest machines; a female could not work upon it. This is the way in which the machine is placed. Our hands

hands must be kept close to the needle bar, consequently you want the light just below the table; but if the light is above it throws the light on the top of the machine and on my head, but does not show any light here (*pointing*) at all: consequently we have to strain our eyes and chance having a finger off. I will show your Lordships that I have a finger off (*the Witness showed his hand*). When we want to have the light down here (*pointing*), and the light is above, we must necessarily strain our eyes. This (*pointing*) is plain seaming, but when it comes to putting in a pocket like this (*pointing to a pocket*), which requires careful skill and attention, you must have a great deal of light to do this; and however skilled a man may be, if he has got insufficient light, he cannot turn out the work as good as he would like to. The public are of course thereby losers. As a good mechanic I would like to do my work right, for the benefit of the public, but when by the neglect of the landlord or the sweater, or whoever it might be, I am prevented from giving a mechanic or worker a good article, which I can do in the time (and a large number of us could make the thing good as easily as bad, but on account of the insufficient light we are unable), then the public is defrauded by bad workmanship, as well as defrauded by the common class of the material. And then the worker himself has to strain his eyes. I have glasses with me which I must wear when I do particular work, and even then I have great difficulty in seeing my work that it shall be done right. So you see the great difficulty we have, and the great complaint there is also of insufficient light, besides the bad ventilation and sanitation.

1791. Earl of *Limerick*.] The insufficient light, to a certain extent, arises from the rooms being so crowded?
Insufficient natural light.

1792. There might be a good light in the room for three or four machines, and not for seven or eight?
Yes.

1793. *Chairman*.] What I understand you complain of is the light coming from above?
Yes, and also from the sides, which would be insufficient light. For instance, coming from this window you want a base window, so that the light should come here (*pointing*) as well. The reason of this is that the dwelling rooms are used as workshops. They have never been adapted as workshops.

1794. Lord *Thring*.] Do I understand you to say that the windows must be specially constructed to give a sufficient light?
Yes.

1795. Point out how?
I would have that window (*pointing to the window*) lower down, taking part of that wood away (*pointing*). We want that a workshop should be specially constructed. I point out in my suggestions that no workshop should be allowed to be opened unless approved by a sanitary inspector.

1796. Earl of *Limerick*.] You want a low light, and to face that light?
Yes; the sweater will put me anywhere; for instance, right over there (*pointing*) if they have a number of machines.

1797. Lord *Clinton*.] Is the gas arranged specially for your work?
Yes, that is bound to be arranged.

1798. You are only speaking of daylight?
Yes.

1799. The gas is properly arranged?
Yes, this side (*describing it*); just as I have got the gaslight fixed I want the light fixed by day. The sweater will put me anywhere if he wants another machine to work with. He can see to work himself, he says; but here (*pointing*) is the machine; he is a baster who has become a sweater, and does not

not understand the machine work himself; consequently he looks upon it like any other machine, that can work anyhow. And that is what we ought to stop; we ought not to allow any man who does not understand the practical work to become a master.

1800. *Chairman.*] Take this room; I understand you could make a light this side, and you could not arrange this room so that they could work either there or here (*pointing*)?

If the machine were placed over there I could not work. I might be able to do plain sewing, but when it comes to putting in pockets, which is very difficult and requires a certain amount of skill to do, a pocket of this kind (*pointing*) in a coat or in a jacket, you want a certain amount of light.

1801. You must have the light from below?

The light must face the whole of this front; the panes of the windows should be constructed in such a fashion that the light should cover the whole of that front; I do not want the light for the wheel at all, and if this machine is placed this way (*describing it*) in an ordinary sweater's den, I have got the light here (*pointing*). That is accounted for by the fact that the sweaters' dens are not constructed for workshops at all, and which I consider ought not to be allowed. The sweater is a veritable despot in his workrooms. He knows perfectly well that any vacancy can be speedily filled; that is, if I make any complaint about the light, or the sanitation, or anything else, the slightest murmur is met by him with an injunction to go elsewhere. Regard for common decency is unknown in sweating shops; one place of accommodation, and that the most filthy and malodorous, serving for as many as 20 workpeople of both sexes. In the place which I work in now it is such that you cannot go into it at all, and of course a female does not wish to go into a place of that description; consequently, though she requires to go, she remains in the workshop until she goes home, and fancy a female sitting in that state eight or nine hours. Of course her health must certainly break down; and it is likewise injurious, not only to herself, but also to the offspring, because they have a sickly offspring at the same time. Worse than all, it is displayed in all its horrible nakedness within the workrooms. The place where I work now, the w.c. is outside the workshop, but in a large number of workshops the w.c. is inside the workshops, and not only that, it is close to a fire. Should there be any danger of a fire from the gas or from the fire-place itself, a person could hardly get out in time to save himself; and I consider that as theatres and other public places are inspected and are under the supervision of the Board of Works, a workshop, or a factory as you may term it, with 200 or 300 hands, should also be under the same supervision, for the sake of the public who are workers. I see not the slightest difference between a body of workers going to a public building and people going into a theatre.

1802. When you say that the w.c. is in the workshop, do you mean there is no partition, no door?

There is a door to the w.c., but no partition to the w.c. I saw one particular case in Princess-street, and that is one of the nicest-looking streets in the East End of London; no one would think, from the outside appearance, that there is any sweater's place at the back. Mr. Fromberg or Cohen is the name; I do not know the number, but there is a lodging-house next to it. Here is the fire-place (*explaining*); the w.c. is next to that; it cuts off the diagonal here; the end of the door when opened touches the stove; so, should a fire arise, the person inside must be burnt. Not only that, but when you go inside you can feel the heat from the door. The factory inspector, I am willing to admit, is a most assiduous individual, but the sweater is too sharp for him. I may mention that the sweaters have two associations; they meet from time to time to consider how they should evade the Act; besides, they have a fund, so that if the Act is evaded, and a fine is placed upon them, the fine comes out of this common fund; so practically it does not injure the sweater at all, and so he can go on evading, and laugh at the legislation. Book No. 40 was a wise institution, a grand innovation, but, well, there are printers who can manage to supply as many No. 40 books as the sweater chooses to buy. A word

word of explanation is required. A clause in the Factory Acts provides that the employers of juvenile hands, girls and lads under age, shall have on their premises a book technically known as No. 40. In appearance this book resembles the conventional cheque book with its counterfoil. Should the young hands be required, as they are nearly all required, to stay at work beyond their legal hours, it is the duty of the sweater to fill up one of the pages of book, No. 40, together with the counterfoil, giving particulars regarding the time during which he wishes the younger hands to stay. It is done in this way: this slip he has to sign, with the date and the time, say one or two hours, which he wishes to work overtime; he must copy this slip on the counterfoil, send this slip away to the factory inspector; then the factory inspector knows he has been working on this particular night. But these sweaters have two books, No. 40. In the event of the inspector putting in an appearance after the legal hours (that is, after eight o'clock), and finding the young hands at work, it is the province of the sweater to produce the book containing the used counterfoil (he has sent one slip away; then he must produce the counterfoil to show that he has already complied with the Acts), together with the corresponding slip which has been torn out. But, however, the visits of the inspector after the legal hours are by no means frequent, and should he not put in an appearance, the duplicate No. 40 is made to do duty instead; with the result that the inspector is bamboozled into believing that by some mysterious coincidence the late nights are those only when he deigns to visit the sweating shops, in which they have two books; one is kept as a forged one, and one is an ordinary book; they are both alike, but one is kept to show the inspector, while the other is kept to do the work of keeping the girls at work late hours. Here (*producing a book*) is a book with 40 pages; each has a page number on; he takes his forged book, or the second book, and writes out the slip of paper, places it on the wall; should the inspector come in, he sees he has been working late if he finds this slip of paper put on the wall; but should he not put in an appearance, this slip of paper is destroyed. Now it may be said, if this slip of paper is destroyed there is the counterfoil to show that the slip of paper has been torn out but not sent away; but then he shows the first book. While the inspector is upstairs he says to the inspector, "Just wait a minute." Then he tears out one slip of the first book. But he can go on working for 20 or 30 nights without the inspector putting in an appearance. These pencil slips are destroyed, and yet we have 20 counterfoils in the second book; but instead of bringing up the second book, he brings the first book with only the first slip torn out correctly. He has been working 20 or 30 nights, and he can go on working every night unless the inspector comes in; and so the inspector is bamboozled. No; this is a trick which has been working for a few years, and it has not yet been arrested. I did suggest to the factory inspector that these books should be numbered, and then the sweater would not be able to do as he does with these books, No. 40.

1803. Have you got one of those books, No. 40, with you?

No, I have not; but I have a torn-out slip somewhere, which ought to have been sent away but was not. Here (*producing a slip*) is one of these slips which should have been sent away but was not. Consequently this man had been working a night without the inspector knowing it. Waterlows supply these, and if I have occasion to come on Friday, I shall bring two copies with me to illustrate it practically. I spoke before of the bad health of the workers arising from the unsanitary condition of the workshops. At page 547, volume 3, John Hughes Bennett, Member of the College of Surgeons, says, "There can be no doubt that the habitual breathing of deoxidized or impure air must greatly impede nutrition."

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Friday next, Twelve o'clock.

Die Veneris, 27° Aprilis, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of DERBY.
Earl of ONSLOW.
Lord CLIFFORD of CHUDLEIGH.
Lord FOXFORD (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord MONKSWELL.
Lord THRING.

LORD KENRY (EARL OF DUNRAVEN AND MOUNT-EARL), IN THE CHAIR.

MR. ARNOLD HENRY WHITE, having been called in; is further Examined, as follows:

1804. *Chairman.*] ON a former occasion you alluded in your evidence to the way in which Government work was put out at Chatham, and gave evidence to the effect that the women who do the work do not receive the full Government price. I believe that since then there has been an investigation into this matter at Chatham, and I would be glad to know if you wished to say anything further about it now. I may say that that question in particular, and the whole question of Government contracts, will have to be gone into thoroughly at a future stage of our proceedings?

The statement I made, as your Lordships will see, if you refer to the printed evidence, was that the women were ignorant of the rates given by the Admiralty, and I added, that it was not surprising that allegations were made that they were not paid according to the published rates. I did not commit myself to the statement that they were not so paid, only that allegations to that effect were made, and that I had been told so. If it had been merely a personal question I would not have troubled your Lordships with the brief statement I want now to make; but as a report has gone throughout the country that in the main the evidence of Mr. Arnold White is exaggerated and incorrect, the rest of the evidence that I have given, including that on the boot trade, is tainted; and it is really for the sake of others, and not for myself, that I have asked permission to make this statement. On reading the allegation in the papers that a court had been convened at Chatham, that it had investigated the charges of sweating, and that it had come to the conclusion that my evidence was incorrect and untrue, I went to the Admiralty, and I asked to see the finding of the court of inquiry; I was refused permission; but in company with my friend, Mr. Terrell (who is present), I saw the Deputy Adjutant General, General Williams, who ordered the court of inquiry. The Deputy Adjutant General made this statement, which I hold in my hand, in the presence of Mr. Terrell, myself, and a colleague of his. The Deputy Adjutant General stated personally to me and to Mr. F. A. H. Terrell that every statement made by Mr. Arnold White, as far as he knows, is true. The court of inquiry held at Chatham, Saturday, the 21st of April, was ordered to be assembled by the Deputy Adjutant General before the evidence sworn to by Mr. Arnold White was given to the House of Lords. The only comment I wished to make on that was that I gave my evidence at 20 minutes to three; and that the counts

of the indictment which formed the reference to this court of inquiry were actually in writing before I gave my evidence. As, therefore, my evidence was not before the court of inquiry, any conclusion they came to in reference to it is obviously irrelevant.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. LEWIS LYONS, having been called in; is further Examined, as follows:

1805. *Chairman.*] Will you continue the statement you made to the Committee on the last occasion. I do not wish to interfere in any way with your own method, and manner, and way of putting the case; but I might perhaps suggest to you that it would expedite matters if you would deal as far as possible first with the facts and grievances of the case, and then give us your suggestions as to what might be done at the close of your observations?

Before I proceed with any further evidence, I should like to ask whether I may be allowed to make a personal statement. I gave evidence here on Tuesday. On Wednesday afternoon a female came to my employer, and said that she represented the Master Tailors' Association, and she told my employer that I had been giving evidence here on Tuesday, and also described the workshops in Plummer's-row, and Mulberry-street, and the neighbourhood. The object of that visit was to get me discharged from my employment, because she said to my employer's son, "Why do you employ such a man who is speaking against the masters?" I thought it best to make this statement before your Lordships, because it shows that there is something wrong in the system, and they are afraid of having it exposed; and secondly, I believe it is intimidation.

1806. Earl of *Onslow.*] Your views on the subject are pretty well known by the master tailors, are they not?

Yes.

1807. Before this Committee was appointed they were known to them?

Yes; I have been discharged for agitation on the subject about 18 times in two years. Of course it is a serious matter to me as a workman that I should be discharged from employment for giving evidence on this subject. Now I will proceed with my evidence. I have brought with me a coat given out by the Government, and worn by the Leicestershire Battalion (*producing a coat*).

1808. *Chairman*] Which battalion is that?

The first volunteers. The contractor to the Government for this coat is I. and B. Pearce and Company.

1809. Earl of *Onslow.*] Did you say the contractor for the Government?

To the Government.

1810. Who do you mean by the Government?

I. and B. Pearce and Company contract with the Government for making up these coats.

1811. Do you mean the War Office?

Yes.

1812. You are sure of that?

I am not quite sure; I do not know who makes the arrangement with I. and B. Pearce and Company; I am not quite certain who gives them this work, but this Pearce and Company sub-let the work to a master tailor in the neighbourhood of Whitechapel. This master tailor sublets the work again to a number of other sweaters. The price for making this coat is 1 *s.*; I do not know what the original price of contract is. There are five button-holes in this coat, and 2 *d.* is paid for them; so there remains 9½ *d.* for making this coat.

coat. You see there is a lot of work in it, and it is hardly possible that this should be made for the 1 *s.* or the 9½ *d.* Consequently the workers have to work long hours, because there are three profits to be made out of them between the actual worker and the wearer of this coat. Of course that necessitates long hours.

1813. *Chairman.*] You do not know what the selling price of the coat is?

No, I do not know, I am just simply pointing out the number of middlemen employed in making up the coat. I spoke on Tuesday of these sweaters who take in persons or greeners and teach them a divisional part of the trade, one or two months, and then turn them out and take on others. I have brought a person of that description with me this morning (*a man stood up*). He is 25 years old; six months ago a sweater took him on to learn the underpressing. He gave him 1 *s.* per day, not 7 *s.* per week, but 1 *s.* per day. If he does not work he does not get paid. Then he raised his wages to 1 *s.* 6 *d.* a day; then to 2 *s.*, then to 2 *s.* 6 *d.* The sweater found that this 2 *s.* 6 *d.* was somewhat too high, and last week he discharged this man, and has taken on another greener to do the same work as his, and is only giving him 1 *s.* per day. I ask your Lordships what is to become of this man; and there are hundreds of these men taken on by sweaters and then turned out. This man, as I said before, was doing the underpressing; he had to press under for 10 machines. These 10 machines turn out between them 150 jackets per day; there are 16 seams in each jacket to press under; consequently he has to press open 9,000 seams per day.

1814. Can you explain the difference between under pressing and pressing?

The under pressing is pressing open the seams only, while the pressing off is done when the garment is finished, like this (*describing*); and there being 16 seams in each jacket he has to press open 9,000 seams per day. Besides that, in order to press open each seam he must lift the iron four times to each seam, and therefore he has to lift the iron 36,000 times during the day. Of course that is hard work in itself. I have brought with me one of those pressing irons (*producing it*). I should like your Lordships to take it in your hand and to see whether it is not laborious work for a man to lift this iron 36,000 times per day.

1815. What does it weigh?

Eighteen pounds; but there are some that weigh 24 lbs. and 26 lbs. 36,000 times he has to lift this iron per day, and for 2 *s.* 6 *d.*

1816. Lord *Thring.*] How many hours is he doing it?

Sometimes 15, sometimes 16. If the iron is hot he has to lift it more times than 36,000. Besides that, he has to run backwards and forwards to the fire, and he has to stand all day, so there is no time allowed for recreation at night; neither is any time allowed for a man to think whether he could join a trade society in order to ameliorate his condition. Cases like these there are hundreds of, but I have brought one with me this morning to show your Lordships what the thing is like. The employer will do with that greener, whom he has taken on in this man's place, the same as he has done with this man. As I said on Tuesday, that under pressing is not of much consequence unless the men can find a place where there are a number of machines at work; and unless this man can find a place where there are many of machines at work, probably he may walk about for months without having any work whatsoever. You see the evil of taking on these greeners and teaching them one divisional part of the trade, which is a misery to themselves. I will dwell now on another Government contractor, and that is Herbert & Co. In February 1887 I made a statement respecting Herbert & Co., to the following effect. A question was asked in the House of Commons, and the Home Secretary denied that the work was sublet, but I have certificates in my pocket to show that they were contracting at that time with sweaters to take the work; and besides, this same Herbert & Co. are giving work out now to middlemen sweaters, and I have the names of three of them. The statement is as follows: "Herbert Brothers & Co. of Bethnal Green-road, E., contract with the Government

to do a portion of their clothing, to which is attached a large profit, but Herbert Brothers do not care a bit how they make profits as long as they make them. Without entering into any details, we will give the working of the system. In the first place, most of the work is sublet to a middleman who contracts to make some work for Herbert Brothers, and has to deposit the sum of 500 *l.* as security for the work thus handed over to his care. He again sublets the work to another middleman, who also has to deposit a certain sum of money. He then distributes the work amongst the sweaters, who take the work home to their dens and get people to work cheap and during long hours. Thus, before the garments are finished, four or five sweaters make large profits, and the workers have to suffer, to speak nothing of the sanitation of the dens." This statement I made because I have the authority for making that statement, and Mr. Conybeare asked a question in the House of Commons, and Mr. Matthews, the Home Secretary, stated : " I have made inquiries into the matter, and he " (that means the Chief Inspector of Factories) " informs me that this firm have formerly contracted for police clothing but are now engaged in other work ; none of the work is sublet to middlemen ; but recently, owing to want of space, some of the work has been given out to old workmen of the firm, who do the work themselves and employ their own people." This statement I made in February, and the Home Secretary says there was no work given out then.

1817. *Chairman.*] Last February?

One thousand eight hundred and eighty-seven. I made it in the early part of February, and I have here two letters, one dated the 31st of January, the same year, which says, " Mr. " (I do not want to mention the name), " if you apply here to-morrow at eleven o'clock I will show you what kind of work I have to give out." Another letter I have here, dated the 2nd of February, the same year, says, " We do not take in any work on Saturdays " (thus showing that he has given the work out to this man). " All the work must be delivered here by two o'clock, Friday, to be paid for in the week. I send you a sample of Shropshire Tunics."

1818. Who is that from ?

From Hebberts to the sweater. Thus clearly showing that he was contracting then to give out the work to middlemen.

1819. Earl of *Onslow.*] What is the date ?

The first one is 31st January 1887, and the second, 2nd February 1887.

1820. *Chairman.*] Will you let me see them ?

Yes (*handing them to the Chairman*). I do not wish to mention the names, because the men gave me those on condition that I should not.

1821. Have you any objection to those letters being put in evidence ?

If the name of the man is not mentioned. I am afraid the man would make a row with me for giving his name in. If you could avoid the name being published, I should have no objection to give the letters.

1822. Earl of *Onslow.*] What I understand you want to prove by these letters is, that Messrs. Hebbert do put work out to sweaters ?

Did at that time, and he does so now.

1823. That is your only point, is it not ?

That is my only point ; because he denied the statement. I have also here a form of security, which was cancelled on 1st February ; and although this was cancelled in 1887, this same firm gives work out now, and to the same sweaters. I have also interviewed some of the out-door finishers of Hebberts and Company, and I have visited them at their own homes. One of them, a woman, had at that time when I visited her, Hartlepool police trousers. I asked her what she was getting for them ; she said she was getting 7 *s.* per dozen ; and I said " How long have you to work on a pair." It would take her from four to five hours to finish one pair ; then she has to find her own trimmings. There is a system at that place that when work is given out the price of making the garment is not stated until the work is taken in ; so, practically, the woman does not know what

what the price for making would be until she takes the garment back, and then they fix their own price; and if the woman refuses to accept that price, she is instantly dismissed. So they can make their own bargain after the garment is finished, and not before.

1824. *Chairman.*] I point out to you that the evidence you are giving is only second-hand evidence?

This particular part of the evidence.

1825. Does the woman you allude to intend to give evidence before the Committee on this point herself?

I have not asked her, but I know where she lives, and I can ask her that question.

1826. You will understand that second-hand evidence of that kind is really of very little value to the Committee?

Exactly so. I have brought with me two books of No. 40, which I think Lord Onslow asked me to bring with me to-day, I do not know what your Lordships wanted me to bring them particularly for, unless you meant me to explain them again (*handing the two books to Lord Onslow*). I do not think I have anything further to say, unless you might ask me questions respecting my statements. Of course I have a lot of statements to make respecting persons whom I have interviewed from other firms, but as your Lordships do not wish to have them, of course I do not wish to make them.

1827. We shall be very glad to have anything of your own personal knowledge, but you will understand that there is no object in telling the Committee what, in your opinion, somebody else said?

I interviewed these women, and, of course, being one in the trade, I could easily see what was the truth of the statements made by these persons, and which was not so. I think if your Lordships would allow me to make a statement of what I know of a firm in Victoria Park, it would give your Lordships an idea that the new system is being introduced, with regard to giving out coat finishing as well as trousers.

1828. You have not a personal knowledge of what you are proposing to state?

I have worked in the firm myself; it is a long while ago now, but I have interviewed the girls lately to see if anything has been fresh introduced into the firm.

1829. Have you anything to say of your own experience on the matter?

I have given my experience on Tuesday.

1830. I think you had better not give any second hand evidence. I would like to ask you some questions as to the particular points that you gave us some evidence on the other day. For instance, you spoke about the evils resulting from minute sub-division in the trade?

Yes.

1831. When did that minute sub-division commence?

About 40 years ago.

1832. And has it been getting worse?

Much worse. There were not so many sub-divisions 40 years ago as there are now; the more sub-divisions there are, the more extensive becomes the sweating, because persons only understand one particular branch of the trade, and these manufacturers or sweaters only teach them this particular branch, and when the busy season is over then these persons are turned out and fresh ones are taken on.

1833. But is not that sub-division the result of improved machinery, the introduction of sewing machines, and so on?

To a certain extent it is; but even with the improved machinery the persons learning the machines do not learn all the particular branches. As I explained on Tuesday, there are good machinists and plain machinists. I have no objec-

tion to a person learning the whole branches of the machine, then he would have to be an apprentice for about four or five years to the machine itself before he could understand all its branches. But as it stands at present it is not so. The same with a presser. This person I have introduced this morning is only an under presser and of very little use to a tailor who has only two or three Singer's machines, unless he has 10 or 12 machines he is very little use to him.

1834. I understand that the sub-division has arisen naturally, but you consider it an evil which ought to be put a stop to?
Yes.

1835. You suggest that it should be put a stop to by some system of apprenticeship?
Four years of apprenticeship, irrespective of age or sex. When the foreigners come over here they come here with the intention of learning the tailoring trade. Of course they do not know that they are only going to learn a divisional part of the tailoring trade; they come here and learn this particular branch of the trade, and some of them, as your Lordships know, come here with large families, and some of them are 30 or 35 years old. Now if there was a four years' apprenticeship, and if these men would have to become apprentices to the sweater for that term, of course he would not much care for that; and the result would be that a large number of these people would be kept back. We do not want any law to keep them back; all that I think is necessary is to put restrictions on employers not to take these persons in and make them mere machines for profit; but if restrictions were placed on the employers, with terms of apprenticeship, of course these men who come here with large families could not afford to be apprentices for four or five years; they would stop away of their own accord.

1836. You think, in fact, that apprenticeship ought to be enforced by law?
I do; because sub-division is only a misery to the persons themselves. I could produce a large number of females who can only do the plain machining, and the employers take advantage of them, and they are bound to work for any price.

1837. Now I want to ask you a question as to the middleman sweaters. We have had it in evidence that the tendency is for the middleman sweater to die out, and that the tendency is to bring the absolute workman or workwoman directly in contact with the manufacturer; that it has been suggested to us that that is an evil, and a hardship to the workpeople; that they are better off when the middleman intervened between them, because they have not to go so far to get their work, and so on. I want to know whether that is your opinion?
No; I can see the drift of that point, that is, that the workers themselves would go to the shop and take the work and do it by themselves. Of course that would be an evil, because it would be a loss of time; but what I suggested was that the manufacturers, instead of giving the work out to these middlemen, should have workshops of their own, and these men who work for the sweaters should be employed direct by the manufacturers and share the responsibility of the Factory Act.

1838. You also told us that the materials worked up into the cheap clothing were very inferior, that some of it did not last more than, I think you said, three weeks?
Yes.

1839. And I suppose you mean that if better materials were employed, clothing would really be cheap and last longer?
Yes.

1840. Your point was that this very cheap clothing, being so bad, is only nominally cheap?
Exactly so.

1841. Is not that a matter that would naturally correct itself. If this clothing is so bad, how is it there is such a demand for it?

It

It is forced upon the public; they will not give them anything else. Manufacturers advertise cheap things; the public is ignorant of its workmanship, also of the material; all it knows is that it can buy a coat for 6 *s.* or 7 *s.*

1842. If a man buys a coat for 6 *s.* and 7 *s.*, and finds by experience that it will only last for three weeks, will he go back to that shop?
No, he goes to another shop and buys the same garment.

1843. Now you also spoke about the fact that this clothing was made up cheaper in the provinces than in London, and that, therefore, the provinces were competing with London in that respect; how do you account for that?
By the introduction of female labour and the short term of apprenticeship, the persons become divisionalists, and they turn out double the quantity of work.

1844. But I mean with regard to the clothing being made cheaper in the provinces as compared with London?
These females only get 4 *s.* or 5 *s.* a week, and the manufacturers there, by this minute division of labour, can go into the market cheaper; the London manufacturer feels the effect of this competition, and he reduces the price of his garments and asks the sweater to take them; the sweater in turn takes them, but he reduces our wages, and works us an hour or two hours longer.

1845. You mean that this minute sub-division and this great cheapness of production of clothing began in the provinces?
I could not exactly say where it began.

1846. I do not understand yet why it is that, as you say, the clothing is made up cheaper in the provinces than in London?
The manufacturers can get the females there to work cheaper; but if these females were taken on for four or five years' apprenticeship, as I suggest, and learned the whole of the trade, they would not work so cheap; it is because they do not know so much of the trade that they are bound to submit to what the manufacturer will give them.

1847. To your knowledge, is clothing distributed among the small villages by the sweaters in the large towns in the provinces?
Yes, it is given out by manufacturers to sweaters the same as it is in London, and then distributed, the finishing work.

1848. I want to know whether to your knowledge the finishing is distributed about to small villages in the country?
Yes.

1849. And then called for after a week or two by the sweater and gathered up?
Yes.

1850. It is done cheaper in that way?
It is done cheaper because a woman can assist her husband in making more money by finishing these things. The husband does not earn very much in the provinces. There is a system being now introduced into the London firms of giving out coats to finish as well as trousers, giving out these coats at 1 *s.* 6 *d.* per dozen. The finishers to do that have to baste round two arm-holes, fell round two sleeve-heads, sew on four buttons, one ticket, and one hanger. They cannot finish one dozen a day, even by working hard. I have brought with me a pair of sleeves to sew in on Singer's machine in order to practically illustrate it to your Lordships. It will not take me more than a few seconds to sew them in, and it will make clearer what I mean by basting round and felling, just to illustrate more fully what I mean. I should like to mention that in order to retain the physical strength of the workers, which was quite exhausted on the old machines, Singer's Manufacturing Company have introduced these new machines, which are much lighter, and easier, and a great boon to the workers. (*The Witness illustrates his statement by working at the machine*). Your Lordships will see, as I explained on Tuesday, that in consequence of the darkness in the sweaters' dens it is somewhat difficult to sew in sleeves of this description,

because the light is against you. The sleeve is now sewn in; to baste it round they have to shove this inside sleeve away with the finger, and baste the lining with their finger right round; then they have to pull this sleeve lining right round, the same as in this coat (*pointing to a coat*); then the buttons have to be sewn on, then the ticket, then the hanger, for $1\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* You cannot finish a dozen a day. The work in itself is hard without the long hours.

1851. You spoke in your evidence also about girls working for 13 hours; is it the custom in the trade for girls to work as long as that?

It is the custom; they evade the Factory Act. If your Lordships would like to see this work I could take your Lordships, any night you wished, to a number of these sweaters' dens, where they do work.

1852. Girls and women?

Girls and women. It is because the price, as paid by the manufacturer to the sweater, is so low, that he in turn makes us work many long hours; and of course he makes these females work as well. I have brought with me a label; the label is given out with the garments. These garments are double-stitched, and they pay 1 *s.*; they are double-stitched men's jackets, and they pay 1 *s.*; there are five pockets lined through, and five button-holes. All that has to be made for 1 *s.* by the sweater; and I know in many cases he cannot get a living himself, consequently he has to make us work long hours; and he employs females as well as men; and if he cannot get enough females, he employs a lot of greeners. I can take your Lordships to a place where you will find on a morning 30 or 40 of these greeners, such men as the man I have brought with me this morning, all waiting to get a job.

1853. About these women and girls, is it necessary that they should work as long as the men, or work these long hours, in order that the portion of the work they do should keep pace with the portion of the work that the men do?

The work is quite different that they do.

1854. But they make a part of the coat?

It is not necessary at all that they should work these long hours?

1855. If they worked shorter hours, you mean, it would not necessitate the men working shorter hours?

Not at all; in fact the men have to work longer hours because they keep a portion of the work over to do, in cases where there are machine hands. They leave off at eight o'clock in some cases, and then we have to work an hour longer, in order to make up the lost time, after the females, but we get nothing for that. But this could well be made the following day; because one day they give you a lot of work to do, and the next day nothing; but if by restrictions being placed upon them we worked shorter hours one day, and come in the next day and make another quarter of a day, it would be much easier for us.

1856. You commented also on what you think the hardships of under-pressers and others, in an inferior grade of workman, being employed to work such long hours and at such low rates of wages, whereas some of the better workmen earn much higher wages; is not that merely the result of the fact that a skilled workman will earn more wages than an unskilled workman?

Yes; but they will not allow him to be a skilful workmen; they will not teach him. This man has been in that place six months; he only knows the under-pressing; they will not teach him anything else; they have turned him out and taken another greener on to do his work. So how can this man have any knowledge of the trade at all? Therefore my apprenticeship system is the thing which I suggest.

1857. Are any of the people employed in your trade liable to any particular diseases or illnesses on account of the nature of their work?

Yes. I have brought here returns of a Trade Society. I should like to mention, first, that in order to abolish the system, there are two Jewish societies in the East End of London. One is the London Tailors and Machinists Society registered, and has been in existence for two years, and has convened about seven public meetings (I will hand this into the Committee), which were well reported,

reported, showing that we tried to assist the workers to ameliorate their condition by organizing them; and at those meetings we have had men coming to us and complaining of the hardships and the effect of such hard work, and they most of them complain of weakness in the chest and the eyes, which results in consumption. I think it is possible that I could bring a return from the London hospitals of the tailors who have been admitted, and of the causes of their admittance.

1858. This pressing work which you describe is very severe?
It is very severe.

1859. Is it true that pressers are very short-lived?
It is true. For instance, take this coat; when he takes this hot iron——

1860. You explained the process to us; but I want to know whether, in your knowledge and experience, the men engaged in that work are very short-lived?
Yes, both from the work and the insanitary condition of the dens in which they work, because they have to press with a wet cloth, and the vapour arising to their mouth and nostrils affects the chest, and when one has to pick up an iron 36,000 times, of course it is much harder still. Therefore, legislation should step in to get these men shorter hours. It is impossible to organise these men, for this reason, that nearly all our meetings have been disturbed by agents of the sweaters; and besides men are intimidated, that if they attend these meetings they will be discharged from employment, so that the men who are dependent upon the sweaters for their living cannot possibly attend, otherwise we should not ask for legislation.

1861. You say you have yourself been discharged 18 times?
In two years.

1862. On account of the prominent part you have taken in reference to this subject?
Both in writing and in speaking.

1863. Have you found any difficulty in getting re-employment?
Yes; in many cases I have had to go under an assumed name, but persons told the employer that they knew my writing and had seen me in public meetings, and they discharged me, not on my account of workmanship, because my present employer will tell you that my work is good, otherwise he would have discharged me when the female representative of the Tailors' Association came to tell them that I spoke against them.

1864. Have you been in pretty constant work the last two or three years?
No; I have been in this place where I now am three months, but between I had had no work for five or six months, my parents trusted me with food, for which I am now paying them off.

1865. Were you working in any trade when you conducted the "Anti-Sweater."
For a number of months I was working in a factory.

1866. Conducting the paper and working in the factory at the same time?
Yes; and my earnings I devoted to the paper; of course the paper did not pay.

1867. How long hours were you working in that factory?
I was working there from nine to seven. I agree with the factory hours but not with the factory system.

1868. And after working in the factory all those hours you conducted the paper?
Yes, and during my dinner-hour I wrote notes of such things as I thought necessary for the paper, and in the morning I rose very early to read proofs, and other such things.

1869. Were you not also on the "Briton" newspaper?
Yes.

1870. Where is that published?
It is not published at all now; it ceased also for want of funds.

1871. Was it published in London?
Yes, in Fleet-street. I was on that paper for 17 weeks. My work on that paper was to write labour articles and notes. I wrote under the title of "Slavery in England," and I had about eight or nine *noms de plume* in that paper; "A Sweater's Victim" was one of my signatures; "Justice" another; "Tribune" another; "A Worker" another; "Kate Sullivan" another; and I wrote under two or three female names.

1872. You did all this work, attending to your regular trade at the same time?
No; while I was on the "Briton" paper (I was on the staff of the "Briton" at the time) I did not work at the machine then. The editor of that paper knew that I conducted the "Anti-Sweater," and I was out of work at that time, and so he sent for me.

1873. You have mentioned from time to time in your evidence what you think might be done in the way of remedies; it would be convenient if you would take them now on the same principle as registration of workshops, and the extension of the "Public Health Act to London, and so on?
I should like to mention, before I suggest my remedies, that I heard one witness, when an advertisement was shown to him, saying that greeners are required, to deny the accuracy of that advertisement.

1874. Are you alluding to the advertisement in a Cardiff paper?
No, a Hebrew London paper; it circulates abroad; I believe the Cardiff paper copied it from the "Briton."

1875. What particular evidence are you alluding to now?
The evidence that I allude to is to show that the sweaters prefer "greener" foreigners because their object is to get them to work cheaper.

1876. You want to prove that advertisements are put into Hebrew papers inducing them to come over here?
Yes, because this paper is largely circulated abroad; and when they see advertisements of this kind they came without knowing the nature of the work.

1877. What is the name of this paper?
This paper is called the "Hachsulamidt"; the date of this advertisement is the 7th May 1887. I reprinted this in the "Briton," likewise translated it, and I believe it was copied in the Cardiff paper. This paper is published in London and circulates abroad.

1878. You say it has a large circulations abroad?
Yes.

1879. And where does it circulate abroad?
In some parts of Russia and Poland. The advertisement was sent from Cardiff; it is a Cardiff advertisement; it is sent to a London paper, so it would naturally lead some of the Londoners to go there as well. The advertisement translated is this: "Wanted an upholsterer; a single man and a greener preferred"; that is the substance of it. Then it goes on to say that one is wanted for polishing.

1880. Is there a particular Hebrew word to signify what you call a greener?
It says here "a greener," and the greeners know their names already when they do come here. It says "A single man and a greener preferred."

1881. How do you know that paper circulates abroad?
I was told so by some of the men who work there, and some of the readers of it.

1882. What is their language, Hebrew?
It is in Hebrew characters, but the language is jargon. I thought I would point this out because the first witness denied the accuracy of the advertisement shown

shown him. The suggestions I have to make to remedy the evils of the sweating system are as follows: First, that every person who desires to establish or work a factory or to transfer an existing one should give notice to the Home Secretary and furnish particulars of the branch of industry he intends carrying out, with plans of construction, and the number of workpeople to be employed. Now if this plan was adopted it would facilitate the work of the factory inspector, and also be a safeguard against the deterioration of the health of the workers; because a license would not be granted to that employer of labour if the place was not in a fit and proper condition for persons to work in. Then that every manufacturer should provide one lavatory for every ten persons. This I think is necessary, as I explained on Tuesday that now we have 20 or 30 persons in one house, and using one w.c.; the local authorities cannot enforce two; and the factory inspector has no power whatsoever to enter them; so between the two we have a state of things altogether indescribable. Then in the next place, every manufacturer should provide for his work-hands who reside too far off to go to meals a place outside the work-rooms where meals could be eaten. Factories at the present time are very badly constructed; there are a large number of persons who live at a distance and bring their food with them, but they have no place where to cook their food; so it is very inconvenient for the workers; and I would suggest this, in the interest of the workers, that they should have a kitchen, a well-ventilated kitchen, for them to go to and cook and have their meals outside the workshop. Then, no employer to be allowed to work his persons more than eight hours a day, both male and female, namely from nine to one, and from two to six. I specify the hours, because some of the employers will want their persons to come in at six o'clock in the morning, and so evade this particular Act should it become law. Then further, I would say that articles necessary for the work might be provided by the employer, but at cost price only. I know of several firms who supply their employés with cotton, and they charge them extra money for that cotton compared with what they could buy it outside; and if the employés would like to buy the cotton outside they cannot because there is a fine placed upon the employés for doing so. The employer says, "I must have my cotton worked in my own goods," and he has a label on his cotton; he gives a large order to a cotton manufacturer, and has special labels printed with the name of the firm, and he charges his employés extra for it. Consequently the workers must either submit to be dismissed or else pay this extra amount for the cotton. Therefore I would suggest that he may provide cotton or trimmings, but at the cost price. Then my next suggestion is that the manufacturers might make bye-laws, but the workpeople should be able to express their opinion on the rules affecting themselves. As it stands now, manufacturers make all kinds of bye-laws and fines; some of the girls (the men also) working in these factories are fined for coming a quarter of an hour late, or walking across the room, or speaking to each other; and these fines must be paid.

1883. Earl of *Onslow*.] Are the fines in vogue where the people are on piece-work as well as where they are on time-work?

Yes, these fines must be paid, and they are deducted off the week's wages; and the workers do not know where these fines go to. Some of the employers pocket the fines, and some of them send them to a charitable institution, but not under the name of the workmen, but under the name of the employer. I consider that an evil; because if the employés subscribe to the institution the employés should be recognised, not the employer. Then there should be a register of factories placed in the vestry of the locality, and open all the week for public inspection. I want a list of all these registered places placed in the vestry, so that any person might go and see whether a certain factory which has just been opened is on the list or register. For instance, as it stands now, a person opens a workshop in a house, or alley, or side street, where the factory inspector cannot find him out. According to my suggestion a list of registered factories (and all workshops must be registered according to this) should be kept in the vestry. If I or any other person in a factory or workshop that is working long hours have a suspicion that it is not registered, how can I find out? The only way is to get to the vestry and see whether this place is on the list of workshops.

1884. *Chairman.*] Why do you select the vestry?
Because the vestry of the locality is the only place known by the ratepayers.

1885. What you want is that the register should be put in some prominent place where everybody in the locality could see it?
Yes; for every man according to that would assist the factory inspector in carrying out his duties; but as it stands now, no man has a right to go and see whether the place is registered, and it is impossible for the factory inspector to find them out. I know he cannot; they dodge him about.

1886. Earl of *Onslow.*] Do you mean that people other than the factory inspector should have power to go into the factory?
No, only that they should have power to see that this place is registered according to the Bill, and if not to at once intimate to the factory inspector; and then that a fine of 10 *l.* should be inflicted on the employer for not imtimating to the factory inspector that he was going to open this workshop.

1887. *Chairman.*] You mean that you, or anybody knowing a room or a place where such work is carried on, could go and see whether it is registered?
Yes.

1888. And if not that you could tell the factory inspectors?
Yes; If the place is registered (according to my previous proposition, the place has been first inspected) then I am satisfied that the place is a fit place for the people to work in.

1889. Lord *Monkswell.*] Should not the fine be paid to the informer?
No, I would give it to the workers, because they work long hours. The fines now go I do not know where; but I consider that the workers who work the long hours should get them.

1890. Ought you not to have some motive given to the person to find out these places?
No, I believe it to be a public duty; the duty of every citizen, to see that the health of the country is carried out. Your suggestion would be to have special men who would make a special business of this, and do nothing else but go about and search into these things. I do not think that it ought to be made a profession of, as I believe it to be a matter of duty for every citizen to see that the health of the locality is preserved. Of course that is my opinion. Then my next suggestion is this: no manufacturer to be allowed to introduce new machinery without Parliamentary sanction.

1891. *Chairman.*] Do you mean that if a man wished to use a new invention he would have to get a special Act of Parliament for him to use it?
No; I had not finished my sentence. If permission were granted to use it, there should be a reduction of the hours of labour, in proportion to the work the machine could produce. You find that a large number of machines are now introduced; one machine could do the work, say, of 50 or 60 persons, while 50 or 60 persons are discharged from employment, and they cannot go elsewhere because the other manufacturers do the same thing; consequently we have a large army of unemployed. Now I would say that this man may introduce machinery, providing he reduces the hours of labour in proportion to the amount of work that would be turned out by this machine, because I want your Lordships to remember that, before introducing his machine, he has already got his profit or return for his capital; and by the introduction of this new machine he has more return for his capital, while the workers were starving or thrown out of employment; he would have the same profit, and it would be much easier for the workers, because the hours would be in proportion, and we should not have such an army of unemployed.

1892. Earl of *Derby.*] But under that system, what interest would he have in introducing any new machine. You propose he should derive no extra profit from it?
He already derives his profit without the introduction of the new machinery; and of course I would ask the workers who work on this machine to pay off so much

much per week for the return of this man's capital used for buying the machine. The object of that is, not to throw so large a number into the ranks of the unemployed.

1893. Do you think our manufacturing system would have attained its present development if such a restriction had been in existence, say, 50 years ago?

As it stand now men are thrown out of work in consequence of the present system, and we should take into consideration the workers as well as the manufacturers. What are the 50 or 60 workers going to do when turned out by the manufacturer, that is what I should like to know.

1894. Earl of *Onslow.*] Would you take the consumer into consideration?

The consumer is getting the things cheaper, but the workers are starving.

1895. Earl of *Derby.*] If I understand it rightly, your proposal is to put a check upon improvements in machinery?

No, I have no objection to improvements; I wish more work could be done by machinery, but I say that a reduction of the hours of labour should be made in proportion. If we can make iron work instead of human beings, I am quite agreeable; but do not let workers suffer by the introduction of this new machinery. Take, for instance, this Singer machine; I am prepared to receive some still more improved machines; you see these machines can turn out 10 times the amount of work and work the same number of hours I am doing; consequently they can do the work of 10 persons. What is to become of those 10 persons? It is true the commodity would be cheaper, but what are those 10 workers for each machine going to do?

1896. Earl of *Onslow.*] But may it not be the fact that in consequence of the reduction in the price the demand for the goods will become much greater?

On the part of those who may have occasion to buy them; but what is to become of those workers who are discharged owing to the introduction of the machinery?

1897. I say, if you succeed by the introduction of machinery in cheapening the production, is it not likely that the consumption may increase so much as to be able to give employment to the hands that would have been thrown out of work otherwise?

No; the manufacturer, seeing that the work can be turned out in such large quantities would give such shoddy material to work with, that though it is a cheaper article, it is really dearer to the consumer, because there is no time allowed to make the commodity up as it should be; and consequently it is much dearer to the working man.

1898. *Chairman.*] At any rate your opinion is that where labourers are discharged by the improvement of machinery that should be taken into account by the manufacturer?

Yes.

1899. Lord *Monkswell.*] If machinery were discovered that would enable a person to make in one hour what he makes in 10, you would not propose that the hours should be reduced from ten to one, would you?

If the same amount of goods could be turned out in one.

1900. *Chairman.*] If the hours were reduced from ten to one, do you propose that the worker should receive the same amount of wages?

The same thing is turned out, the manufacturer would not lose by it; the workers would benefit by it.

1901. Would you propose that the rate of wages should be fixed at the same amount?

I have no objection, but what I consider would be this; that, for instance, the rate of wages should be fixed by a Board of Tailors or a Board of Bootmakers to rule that particular trade. In the old City Guilds each company had its board where disputes of trade were settled by them. I should select a board from the trade itself, and of course they would understand what the wage would be.

1902. Is there any other remedy that you wish to suggest?

The last one would be that the neglect of the above rules by the employer should be punishable by the forfeiture of his license. That is with regard to all the rules. The public-houses and music halls are licensed and they only get a profit by the privilege of the State; and I consider that the employers of labour should be under the same restrictions, because it is practically protecting the workers, likewise the public. I have another suggestion which I left out before, that is, that if apprentices were taken it should be for not less than four or five years, and the whole of the trade should be taught; that is a special thing which I lay stress upon, because it is a very miserable life to live for one who only knows a divisional part of the trade.

1903. You mean that it is very desirable that the whole trade should be taught to them?

Yes, because else it is only a miserable kind of business, and the public are only defrauded by this divisional labour, and they do not really get anything by it.

1904. What you do mean by the trade settling the rate of wages is something in the nature of what we have heard of at Northampton?

Yes. This Board of that particular trade would know the value of the labour time, the amount of time expended in producing a certain commodity; this board understanding the technicalities of it would know what rate of remuneration should be given for that labour time.

1905. Do you mean that the masters and men should form a kind of board to decide what the rate of wages should be?

That could be done.

1906. There is nothing to prevent them doing it now, is there?

No, I do not see why there is. It was only in reply to your Lordship's suggestion that the State should regulate the wages that I named that.

1907. I did not suggest it?

I believe your Lordship asked, would I wish that the State should regulate the wages. They may, but if there is a better method of adjusting wages of course I should accept it.

1908. Lord *Thring.*] You say you think that every man ought to be taught the whole of his trade. Now take that very machine then; do I understand you to say that you think the whole of that machine ought to be made by one person who should know to make the whole of it. It is partly wood, partly iron, with most complicated adjustments of the most beautiful sort. I want to know whether you think that that machine ought to be made wholly by one workman, or by a person who understood how to make every bit of it?

No. This (*pointing to the stand*) belongs to the furniture department.

1909. But the whole of the iron work?

Exactly so. I do not say that one man should make the whole, but that he should understand the making of the whole.

1910. Should be able to make the whole?

Yes; they could divide their labour afterwards if they liked. For instance, if I know all the branches of my trade, one day I could machine, the second day I could make arrangements with another man, "You machine to day, and I will press to day." We could divide our labour by-and-by; because, as it stands now, by the subdivision of labour when one man leaves off work, or is unable to attend, the whole workshop is affected; but if everyone understood his trade there would be no necessity for them all to leave off on account of one. It is a most peculiar thing in this division of labour.

1911. Earl of *Onslow.*] But is not your tailoring trade peculiar in that respect from others; it would not apply, for instance, to the sewing-machine trade in the same way, would it?

Yes, there is subdivision in some cases in making up machines. I cannot speak with any authority on engineering; I should not attempt to answer that question properly.

1912. Lord

1912. Lord *Thring.*] Take the case of watchmakers; would you say that everyone who entered into the watchmaking trade should be capable of making the whole of a watch?

Yes; because where there is subdivision of labour there is a great deal of sweating.

1913. You are aware of course that in watchmaking all those little wheels and every part of the watch are practically made by separate workmen?

Yes.

1914. You wish that one man should understand how to make the whole of it?

Yes; then they could divide their labour if they liked.

1915. *Chairman.*] I do not propose so far as I am concerned, to ask you any more questions about the politico-economical aspect of the case, but I want to be quite sure that I understand what you mean by the licensing and registration of factories. As I understand you, you think that all factories and workshops, and I suppose all dwelling-rooms where this work is carried on, should be registered?

Yes.

1916. And that the register should be kept in some prominent place so that everybody should have access to it?

Yes.

1917. And you further think that licenses ought to be granted subject to certain conditions as to sanitation and so on?

With regard to the license, I mean that before a person opens a workshop he should send in notice of his intention to the Home Secretary, and if the Home Secretary is satisfied with the report of the sanitary inspector, then a license to open as a workshop should be granted to him.

1918. You do not propose to charge any registration fee, or anything of that kind?

Not at all.

1919. Earl of *Onslow.*] First of all, with regard to the contractors who put out work to the sweaters, I think you said that your complaint against Messrs. Hebbert was in respect to a contract for police clothing?

In this particular case it was police clothing; but I know now of a sweater to whom he gives military and police trousers.

1920. Do you know whether the police contracts are Government contracts?

I could not say that; but Hebbert advertises himself as Government contractor; that is the name over the door.

1921. Do you know how much of the Government contracts are put out in the East-end of London, what proportion?

I do not know what proportion, but there are four places who advertise as Government contractors, and give the work out; for instance, Webb's, in Dodd-street, Limehouse; they do Government work, and give their work out; Comptons.

1922. Do you know what Government work; what kind of clothing?

I could not exactly say where they belong to.

1923. You mentioned Compton and Hebbert and Webb?

Yes.

1924. And what is the fourth?

Pearse and Company, whom I mentioned this morning; they advertise as Government contractors; but I do not know what contracts they take. I only brought this coat with me to show because it was one that I could get.

1925. Do you know whether the work that they put out to sweaters is the work that they receive from the Government, or the work that they receive from private people?

They contract with the Government for their work, as I understand.

1926. You heard the evidence of Mr. Arnold White as to the Factory Clause in the Government contracts?

Yes.

1927. Do you allege that they habitually break the Factory Clause then?

I do.

1928. In respect to what clothing?

Government contracting.

1929. Are you aware what clothing the Government contract is for?

No, I am not prepared to answer that unless I make thorough investigation into the facts.

1930. Then why do you make the statement that the Government contracts are put out to sweaters?

This coat, I believe, is worn by the soldiers in Leicester, if I am not mistaken. This has gone to the Leicestershire battalion.

1931. That is a volunteer coat, you said?

But I am given to understand that the volunteer work is Government work as well.

1932. You believe that the War Office put out the volunteer contract?

I believe so.

1933. Do you know whether in the contract for police clothing there is the Factory Clause?

Only what I have heard of from Mr. White.

1934. You do not know yourself whether the police contracts do or do not contain the Factory Clause?

No, I am not prepared to say.

1935. If the Factory Clause was not contained in the police contracts there would be no violation of the Factory Clause, would there?

Certainly not.

1936. You said, in reply to Question 1774, addressed to you, that you would show the number of societies that are in existence at the present time; I do not think you did do that?

I said I would show you the number of societies in the East-end of London who convened meetings, and are established for the purpose of agitating against the sweating system. The first is called the London Tailors' and Machinists' Society; its registered number is 443. The objects of this society, according to rule 2, were "(*a*) to reduce the hours of labour; (*b*) to maintain the normal day's work from eight to eight (subject to alteration), with an interval of one hour for dinner, and half an hour for tea; and (*c*) to obtain for its members healthy workshops by the best legitimate means." In order to carry out these we were obliged to call public meetings to explain why these rules were inserted. There is also another society called the Jewish Branch of the Amalgamated Society of Tailors. There are 15,000 members belonging to the society, as a whole, but there is a Jewish branch in the East-end of London established this last four or five years. The question was put to Mr. Stephany. Was he aware that there were any societies or trades unions in the East-end of London agitating against the system? These are two societies; of course there are several branches of the Amalgamated Tailors in the East-end of London. We did try to form a branch of the London Tailors' and Machinists' Society in the West-end, because there is more sweating, and a larger number of unhealthy dens, in the West-end, where the best work is made, than there is in the East-end; and of course the inspectors cannot find them out there as they dodge them about about so often. These are the societies which I told your Lordship I could mention.

1937. Your answer to my question is that there are more sweating places in the West-end than there are in the East-end?
No, more sweaters; I mean that they work longer hours.

1938. Do you mean in the bespoke business, or the ready-made business?
The bespoke business; there is very little ready-made done in the West-end; the ready-made goods for the bespoke shops are sent down to the East-end dens.

1939. *Chairman.*] Have you a personal knowledge of the West-end of London?
I have worked in some of the shops in the West-end.

1940. You are speaking of what is within your own knowledge?
Yes.

1941. Lord *Thring.*] If I order a suit of clothes of my West-end tailor, do you mean to say that there are any great number of tailors in the West-end bespoke business who employ sweaters?
Yes; middlemen sweaters to give the work off the premises, and they employ others. I could mention a large number of names.

1941-2. You mean it is the general system of the West-end bespoke business, the order business, to employ sweaters, and that it was as bad as the employment of them in the East-end?
Yes; and the same subdivision of labour as in the East-end.

1943. Lord *Sandhurst.*] But is there the same "scabbing" of work in the West-end as in the East-end, under-pricing?
Yes, because the subdivision of labour finds its way to the West-end?

1944. Lord *Thring.*] Can you give us any particulars of the West-end sweating, supposing I was to go into it?
I could not give exactly the names of the streets now, but I could furnish your Lordships with them. It is a long while since I have worked in the West-end, but I know where they are.

1945. By "a long while" do you mean years?
A couple of years ago.

1946. Your belief is that it is going on at the present moment?
It is, and extending as well.

1947. Earl of *Onslow.*] Of what nationality are the sweaters?
I find them mostly Jewish. It is not a question with me whether they are Jewish or Gentile; it is a question of labour. Of course I cannot deny the fact that there are Jewish sweaters up there.

1948. I should have said, perhaps "the sweaters?"
The sweaters are both English and Jewish.

1949. Lord *Thring.*] Are you aware that we have been told that the sweating system does not extend to the bespoke business or order business at all?
I can prove that it does. I shall be ready to come any day you wish and give the names of the streets and the names of the dens; because we tried to form a society, and had a large number of men there to address the meeting.

1950. Earl of *Onslow.*] You did not say why the trade unions formed for the purpose of keeping up the prices of work failed?
They have not failed; we are still in continuance.

1951. By "failed" I do not mean ceased to exist, but failed in their object?
They have not failed, because this inquiry is the result of our agitation.

1952. But have you succeeded in the object of raising prices?
No, we have not.

1953. To what do you attribute that?

Because the workmen have not any time to consider the evils connected with it; we cannot get them to combine; and besides, if we educate a number of men one day, one lot goes away to America and another lot comes in, and we are continually keeping on educating them, and we cannot get them to combine; because, before we get a man into our society, we should like him to understand what he is belonging to it for; we want not to take his money simply and for him to sit there, but we want him to understand the object. We meet every Sunday night at our place, and we have organised two public meetings, one for next Sunday night and one for the Sunday night following. I should like to invite your Lordships to one of these meetings; you would see some of these workers there.

1954. Where are they held?
At the "Man in the Moon," Plough-street, Commercial-road, East.

1955. What language is spoken?
Both English and jargon. We first speak English and then translate it to some of them.

1956. You attribute the failure to raise the price of wages to the recent immigration of foreigners and provincial strangers?
Partly. Some of the men will not combine though they do understand our object.

1957. Now, there was one point I did not clearly understand you about; you said, with reference to the sanitary condition of the workshops, that one reason why they are not in the condition which they ought to be in was because the Public Health Act did not apply to the metropolis?
Yes.

1958. Did I understand you to say that you wished it should be extended to the metropolis?
Yes; I spoke to the Sanitary Inspector of St. George's, and told him of a large number of unsanitary sweating dens, and he told me he had not very great powers. I referred him to the Public Health Act, and he told me what was the case: and I said: "Are you aware that the Factory Inspector is bound, by a clause in the Act, to tell you from time to time of these works?" and he said, "Yes, and they do tell me; week after week I receive addresses from the Factory Inspector, but the only powers we have are, under Sec. 81, c. 120, of the Metropolis Local Management Act, 1855.

1959. Why do you think those powers insufficient; are they not almost identical with the powers under the Public Health Act?
No; he tells me he has no power to enforce two w.c.'s, one for males and one for females, unless there are more than 20 persons in the house; but the Public Health Act specially says, I believe, that there should be two w.c.'s, one for men and one for females; they have not that power under this Act; the only power they have is under the 81st section of the Act.

1960. Now with regard to the registration, I understood you to say that you would not charge any fee for this registration?
No.

1961. But you would propose, I presume, a penalty for non-registration?
Yes.

1962. Have you formed any idea what amount you would make that penalty?
I think 5 *l.* for the first offence; and if he evaded the other portions of what I suggested, he should forfeit his license, which should be granted to him when the Home Secretary is satisfied with the report of the sanitary condition. This would be only a protection to the workers, nothing else.

1963. And what number of people would you allow to work together without such registration?

I would

I would suggest that no person be allowed to work in a workshop unless he has nine square feet space.

1964. But I ask you what number of people would you allow to work together without such registration?
I should not allow them to work if there was not sufficient space for each worker.

1965. That is not what I am asking; you wish that every place in which persons are working together for profit should be registered?
Yes.

1966. How many working together; I want to know how many people working together would in your opinion be a workshop which should be registered; should it be only one person or should it be more than one person?
I should not allow a person to open a workshop unless he could employ 20.

1967. Then you would not require a family of three persons, for instance, working together to register?
No.

1968. *Chairman.*] As I understand you, you mean that you would not allow work to be carried on at all except in workshops containing 20 persons?
Yes. I should not allow a private family to work at home and use it as a workshop unless they had 20 hands. I simply put that number; I have no particular reason for it.

1969. Earl of *Onslow.*] Would it not be a very great hardship on say three or four members of a family that they should be unable to take work home, into their own rooms?
I think it would be a blessing to them, because they are only creating evils by such conduct; you see there is no registration whatever.

1970. Earl of *Derby.*] What are the evils that arise, in your judgment, from two or three persons, say members of the same family, taking their work home?
Competition amongst the workers themselves.

1971. You do not mean that it is an evil for them, but that their being able to work in that way increases competition?
It is an evil so far as the manufacturer would from time to time reduce the prices, and consequently there would be a tendency to introduce child labour; that is my point.

1972. Therefore, if I understand you, you wish to bring together the workers into groups of not less than 20 in each place, in order that they may be in a better position to make their own terms with the masters?
Yes.

1973. That is quite independent of any sanitary inconvenience arising from small rooms?
Well, of course, insanitation arising from small rooms where there is no workshop I cannot at all interfere with; that is a question for the local authorities; now I am only speaking of the factories. Besides, my suggestion that the place should be registered for not less than 20 is made because it would lessen the sweaters; you would not have a sweater getting up in the world so quickly. Some of these greeners come over here, and in less than three or four years they are sweaters; they go on competing; I would prevent that.

1974. Earl of *Onslow.*] In fact it would drive the trade out of what is known as the sweaters' dens into what would practically be a factory?
Yes, or workshop; a place where the work would be regulated.

1975. Now I want to ask you one or two questions upon the point of sanitation. I understand that the habits of the people who use these closets are not altogether the habits of Englishmen; would it be in your opinion an advantage

that instead of the closets being made of wood, as they are commonly in England, they should be made of iron or stone to suit the habits of the foreigners employed in these trades?

Not at all; their habits are exactly the same as those of Englishmen; only they have not the convenience to carry out those habits. I know they come here in some cases not in a very clean condition, on account of the voyage; but I assure you they have clean habits, as good as any other person; but in consequence of the closeness of the room it is impossible to carry them out. I have visited some of the families where seven or eight, including the husband, live in one room. It is impossible, when the wife has to prepare the children to go to school, that she can do the domestic work at the same time; consequently it is neglected; but if they had two or three rooms they could keep two rooms clean, and the third room would be a kind of mess-room, which could be cleaned whenever they chose. It is on account of the lowness of wages that they cannot afford that, but their habits are quite equal to those of Englishmen.

1976. Would you be prepared to extend the powers of the factory inspector to sanitation outside the workshop?

No; I should only ask the factory inspector to deal specially with factories and workshops, but I should give him sanitary powers.

1977. By "outside" I mean outside the actual room in which the work is carried on; such places as the staircase, the yard, and so on?

Yes, providing that house is registered as a workshop. I should give him the power of enforcing the sanitation himself without going to the sanitary authorities.

1978. Then would you wish the inspector to be, as has been suggested by one witness, an expert in the particular trade he was called upon to inspect, or would you wish him to be a medical officer?

Not particularly. I should wish the factory inspector to be an expert in the particular trade, and, whenever he chose, that he should be able to take with him a medical officer. I believe in France one of the factory laws says that a commission is to be elected from time to time, and this commission has the power to take with them a medical officer.

1979. You would have an expert in the trade, who should be empowered to take with him a medical officer?

When he wishes; and I should have the inspector drawn from the particular trade, such as a tailor from the tailors, and a bootmaker from the bootmakers. Suppose that I should go and superintend the workshops of the bootmakers, I should not know the dodges of the bootmakers.

1980. Do you think that the sanitary inspector and the local authority are aware that with them alone rests the duty of inspecting the sweaters' dens, and not with the factory inspector?

They have no power to inspect the sweaters' dens unless they have intimation that there are more than 20 persons working in the place. For instance, they could not order the sweater or the landlord to whitewash his premises, nor could they ask the sweater to have proper ventilating shafts in the workshop; they have no power to do that.

1981. Now, I want to ask you a question with reference to the rent; I understood you to say that the landlord should be called upon to put the premises into a proper sanitary condition; would it not be probable that he might, if so called upon, increase the rent of the rooms?

Yes, he would; but then the State should interfere, and only allow so much rent to be paid for a certain amount of space.

1982. But I should like to ask you whether you do not think that the landlord now exacts as much rent as he is able to obtain?

Yes; if he could exact more he would do it.

1983. Then you do not think that if he were compelled by any authority to place

place the premises in a proper sanitary condition he would be able to get any more rent out of the people?

He would force it out of them.

1984. You think they could pay it and would pay it?

They would be compelled to pay it.

1985. Then you do not think that the maximum has been already reached?

The landlord may charge whatever he pleases, but sometimes he may make a reduction and sometimes he may not. I could not say what the bargain of the landlord would be with the tenant, but I know that in the East-end the landlords are very hard.

1986. But you do not think that they have got already as much rent as they could possibly squeeze out of their tenants, and that, therefore, if they had to lay that money out on their premises they could not squeeze more out of their tenants?

I am of opinion that they could not get more than they do at the present time. For instance, in the houses in Plummers-row and Mulberry-street they charge from 4 *s.* to 6 *s.* for the workshops which are built there; and if he were to ask another shilling he might get it, but if he were to get it the wages of the workers would be reduced.

1987. With regard to the deception practised on the inspector by book No. 40, have you any suggestion to make by which that might be remedied?

There are two suggestions; one would be to abolish overtime altogether, but if overtime could not be abolished I would have certificates numbered, and would let no person be allowed to go to the printer's to buy a book unless he gets a written statement from the factory inspector himself. That would prevent the sweater getting two books.

1988. Would you restrict the hours of labour of adult labourers?

Yes.

1989. Do you think that would be a popular measure amongst the labourers themselves?

I can only speak for my trade, and it would be there, because the work in itself is laborious; and though, of course, we know that work is a pleasure to every workman, when he comes to do too many hours it is not much pleasure at all.

1990. Then you think that the workman is not able to act for himself but requires to be protected by the law?

Yes; because if a body of workmen were to ask for a reduction of the hours of labour they would be discharged. For instance, in my case I have been agitating and I have been asking for what I suggest here, and I have been discharged and another man has been put in my place. I am only one, but there are hundreds of the same sort who for simply expressing the opinion that they would like shorter hours are discharged. As for myself, I have only myself depending upon me, and I have to cut through; but when it comes to a married man with five or six children it is impossible for that man to hold out, and for the sake of his children he is bound to submit; and the result is that the sweater and the manufacturer get the profit, and so the thing continues.

1991. Earl of *Derby*.] You propose, as I understand, the restriction of adult labour to certain hours?

Yes.

1992. Would not the natural effect of that be to lower the wages; would a man be able to earn as much in a day as he earns now?

It would amount to the same thing, and I will explain it: We work to-day 16 hours; to-morrow we are idle; supposing we get 7 *s.* or 6 *s.* for the day, if our wages were reduced to 4 *s.* or 4 *s.* 6 *d.* for 10½ hours that would bring it up to the same wages. It is only a question of distributing the work.

1993. It is not a question of reducing the total amount of the work done, but distributing it more equally over the days of the week you mean?

Yes. I do not ask that the wages should be reduced at all, because the distribution of the labour time would make up for the lessening of wages.

1994. Reverting to what you said as to putting restrictions upon the use of new machinery, I do not quite understand in what way you supposed that the employer would be led to introduce new machinery, if in consequence of so doing he was compelled to make a reduction in the hours of labour so as to cut off any profit he would gain by introducing the new machinery?

Of course if he gets no advantage he would not introduce the new machine; it would not affect us then whether he introduced the machine or not.

1995. That is what you wish, that he should not introduce the new machine?

Yes, but if he was to introduce the new machine we are protected by that restriction. If he is a kind-hearted employer and sympathises with the work-people he would introduce new machinery for the purpose of reducing their hours of labour, because the same amount of work would be turned out; but a hard employer who does not sympathise with them would not introduce that new machinery.

1996. Then no mechanical improvements would henceforth be introduced except in consequence of the benevolent feeling of employers?

But if there was any new invention the workers would, I believe, force the employers to buy it; it is quite possible that the workers would combine to force employers to buy this improved machine to lessen the hours of labour. Of course under the present circumstances I ask the workers to return the capital laid out by the employers, not at once but by paying so much per week.

1997. You think that the working men by combining would be able to force upon the employers the use of any new machinery?

Yes, for the benefit of the workmen.

1998. But if they have that power of combination, what prevents them from using it for the relief of their present difficulties. Let me put it in this way: either they have the power to combine effectively or they have not?

I said it would be probable that they would combine to force the employer.

1999. If they have power of effective combination how is it that they do not use it at present?

Because in many cases the workers are intimidated now, and besides, we cannot always get the workers together; because there is a large number of sweating dens, and we cannot get all the workers together to make them understand the particular object; but if there were fewer sweating dens there would be more likelihood of getting them together to understand it. When there are 20 workmen in one shop we could speak to 20 men at one time, but if they are divided amongst five sweating dens we have to speak five times to the same number, and consequently it is much harder to get them to combine; we have found that in practice.

2000. You want to bring them together into groups of not less than 20 in order to organise a power of resistance against the employers?

Yes.

2001. And you want the law to help you in doing that?

I think it is necessary, as I explained, for the workers cannot do it, because some of them are married.

2002. Would you be prepared to introduce this rule as to new machinery into all trades, or are you speaking of your own particular employment only?

No, for all trades; I am not speaking for one trade.

2003. You have no doubt had considerable experience of the feelings and opinions of people in your own class of life; should you think that is a general feeling amongst those you represent?

Exactly

Exactly so. At several public meetings we passed resolutions, and this rule was carried unanimously.

2004. Earl of *Limerick.*] Would you leave the appointment of the sanitary inspector to the same authority as appoints now?
No, I would give sanitary authority to the factory inspector; I should not give factory powers to the sanitary authority.

2005. Would you give the sanitary powers generally, do you mean, or only as regards the factories, to the factory inspector?
I would only give the factory inspector such sanitary powers with respect to the workshops only and places leading to them, such as staircases and so on.

2006. Have you any reason to think that the sanitary inspectors, from the mode of their appointment, or from any other cause, are at all lax in discharging their duties at present, I mean generally, in carrying out sanitary inspection?
In some cases, because there is a certain amount of favouritism in the vestries, and a large number of landlords generally obtain admission to the vestries for three years; and they are the owners of these places, and some of the servants generally side with the vestry.

2007. At present all the power that the factory inspector has in the case of a want of proper sanitary provision is to report the default or neglect to the sanitary authority, is it not?
Yes, when he finds a sanitary neglect, he reports to the local sanitary authority what he has found.

2008. And it rests with that authority to carry it out or not, as they think proper?
Yes, only with regard to the other parts of the building; but the factory inspector should enforce the whitewashing of a workshop. Some of the workshops are very bad, and I should be most happy to take any of your Lordships to some of these places; and I do not think you would go in a second time if you went in once.

2009. Earl of *Onslow.*] But what I understand you to say is, that you wish to have the power now vested in the sanitary inspector and the local authority vested in the factory inspector?
And to include the Public Health Act.

2010. Earl of *Limerick.*] For the purposes of factories?
Factories only.

2011. Then I presume that your idea is to have all the work done in factories of not under 20?
Yes.

2012. Earl of *Onslow.*] But supposing that your ideas were not carried out, would you still think that those powers should be given where two or three people were employed?
Yes, but to include the Public Health Act; that is the most important point. I made an application to the Thames Police Court some time ago respecting this.

2013. Lord *Monkswell.*] One question about the machinery. Take the illustration I gave you just now; suppose there is a machine that should do in one hour the work of 10; your proposition is that the workers should only work one hour instead of 10?
Yes.

2014. Would not workmen in their own interest insist on working more than one hour to increase their wages; could you keep down their hours?
That would be settled by the board, that I suggested before would be elected from the particular trade.

2015. You think you would be able to keep down the hours of labour?
Yes.

2016. I understand that you complain very much about the competition from the provinces that keeps down prices; does the greener immigration affect the provinces?
No, but there is the female labour there and the short term of apprenticeship; they affect the London people again.

2017. My point is that London is better off than the provinces, notwithstanding the greener immigration; you now say that competition from the provinces is beating you down, and that provincials are coming to London?
I do not think I said that it is altogether on account of the greeners that the competition exists; I said that the introduction of female labour, and the short time of apprenticeship, beats down the price of the London manufacturer; and in order to compete the London manufacturer wants to get his labour done cheap; it does not matter whether he takes on females or greeners.

2018. You do not think the immigration of greeners to the East-end is the only or principal cause of this distress?
No, but I say they are a misery unto themselves because they do not learn the whole of the trade.

2019. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] You talked of the wages and the hours of labour being settled by a board; what do you imagine would be the constitution of that board; of whom would it consist?
A number of men elected by the workers themselves.

2020. Any masters?
Yes, it would include some of the masters; but I say if there is a better method of settling it I will accept it. I do not bind myself to this one.

2021. And a Government authority?
I should invite a Government authority to be present or to have a vote on those occasions.

2022. But the majority of the board would be composed of working men?
Of working men. For instance, the factory inspector could be included in this board as being drawn from the trade.

2023. *Chairman.*] You think that work should be confined by legislation to workshops which should contain, you suggest, 20?
I have no particular reason for suggesting that number.

2024. And that is partly, as I understand, in order that the workpeople should be able to combine better for their own protection, and also partly to ensure better sanitation?
Yes, and less competition amongst sweaters.

2025. Now, do you mean to say that women trouser finishers or shirt finishers should not be allowed to take any work home to their own homes?
No, they should not; that is the evil which I complain of.

2026. You think it ought not to be permitted?
That ought not to be permitted, and that is the reason why we ask for shorter hours in the factories.

2027. I suppose you have no suggestion to make as to how these women who make some money by doing that kind of work are to be recouped for the loss?
What loss?

2028. It is obvious that a married woman being at home with her children to take care of could not go out to do a day's work in the factory you propose should be set up, but she gets work now at home; you would deprive her of the means of earning wages any more?

If

If the husband earned sufficient money there would be no necessity for his wife going out to work.

2029. You would propose, at any rate, that these women who have given evidence before the Committee should not be allowed to do the work in their own houses?

I would not allow it, because that is the cause of the evils. If we allow the thing to go on we shall increase greatly the sweating system; we cannot allow this kind of sweating to go on for one particular body of men, or for another.

2030. Now, you said the other day that you did not attribute the evils of the sweating system to the "greeners;" that you did not consider them a principal cause of the evils?

No, I do not.

2031. But you said just now that one of your difficulties in getting men to combine was, that so many of these greeners were constantly coming in, and a great many of them constantly going away to America?

Yes.

2032. To your knowledge, do a great many men in your trade go to America?

Yes; they go away, and when they have no work there they come back again here.

2033. They go to America, do they?

All that I know do go to America, because the mode of work that is done in London is now being introduced into America.

2034. They have to be possessed of a certain amount of means to go to America?

Yes; they are assisted to go over there. In one particular case which came to my notice incidentally a woman has her husband over in America, or some place there, and she is assisted by the Jewish Board of Guardians to go over to her husband.

2035. Then you were not quite correct the other day in saying that the greeners were not the cause of the evil, because you now say that they are to a certain extent?

I still hold to my view that the greeners are not altogether the cause of the evil, but that the sweating system is the cause of these greeners coming over here, and, when once they are over here, it is somewhat difficult to get them to understand the evils of the system; that is my view.

2036. You said just now that you considered that the evils of the sweating system were just as intense in the West-end as they are in the East-end?

Yes.

2037. Would you be prepared on a future occasion, if the Committee wishes it, to give evidence on that point?

Yes; and to bring you the names and addresses of the occupiers; also the size of the workshops and the number of persons working in them, the same as in the East-end of London.

2038. I understand that you worked in the West-end some two years ago?

Yes.

2039. And would be able to give evidence with respect to work in the West-end of your own personal knowledge.

Yes.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

27th April 1888.

MR. SOLOMON PLATTMAN, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

2040. *Chairman.*] WHAT are you by trade?
I am a Tailor's Machinist.

2041. You have heard, I think, all the evidence given to the Committee by Mr. Lyons, have you not?
Yes.

2042. And in such parts of it as deal with the facts and conditions of the trade, do you generally agree with him?
I do.

2043. You are in the same line of business as he is?
I am.

2044. Perhaps you would give the Committee any information supplementary to what Mr. Lyons has already given us; you need not go over the same ground. The Committee would like to hear from you what you have to say about the condition of the trade?
The workshops are very bad, and they work long hours, and sometimes we have nothing to do for weeks and weeks, but have to go idle, and the wages are not paid regularly; one sweater pays on Friday, one pays on Saturday, one pays on Sunday, and one pays nothing; you have to summon him for it. I can state that two years ago there was a sweater in Brick-lane, No. 116, of the name of Goldstein; he kicked out three people, two machiners and one presser, and they never have been paid yet, because he bore false witness, I might say; and I may state that the barrister, Mr. Thompson, who attended the case could not get those men paid, and so, of course, the case has been dismissed.

2045. What I understand is, that their claim was dismissed; that they made a claim for wages, which claim was dismissed by the court?

Mr. *Lyons.*] Dismissed on account of the false witnesses produced by Mr. Goldstein; the case is reported in the "Anti-Sweater."

2046. *Chairman* (to the *Witness*).] You were saying that wages are not paid regularly?
No.

2047. And that is quite a different point from the one you raise now, that the master did not, according to your opinion, pay his debts; what have you to say about being paid irregularly; what objection have you to their paying, as you say?
These are people coming over, and they become themselves masters, without capital, and they are not able to get a sufficient profit out of the workmen; they cannot pay regularly the wages due to those they employ.

2048. When ought the wages to be paid?
On Friday, when the work is left off.

2049. You say that wages due on Friday are not paid till Saturday or Sunday?
That is the case; they have not paid any wages for the last week. I have had this week only three coats to make. On Tuesday morning I pieced up three coats, and I went away to give my evidence here, and when I came back another machiner had been sent for to fill my place, and they have not paid my wages yet for the last week.

2050. Do I understand you that a week's wages are owing to you?
Yes, a week's wages are owing to me.

2051. Have you any other complaint to make about the condition of the workers?

I should

I should point out to you that if these small sweaters that are not able to pay their wages regularly, and who are not able to keep a workshop properly, who only carry on this sweating system in back rooms and garrets, were done away with, it would be better for the working people.

2052. You agree with Mr. Lyons that it would be better if the work was carried on in workshops?
I do.

2053. How long have you been in this country?
I have been here since 1872. I stopped in France for five years, and I came back in 1878.

2054. Where do you come from?
I come from Poland.

2055. Did you go into the trade immediately on coming to London?
Yes.

2056. And why did you go to Paris?
Because I did not have much work to do here at that time, I went to Paris.

2057. And worked at the same trade there?
Yes.

2058. And you found you were no better off there?
I was better off there. I did not come here with the intention of stopping here, but to go to Australia; but when I went to the shipping office I found that I had to pay 21 guineas; I had not sufficient money, and so I stopped here.

2059. And you have never earned sufficient money for that?
I have never earned sufficient money.

2060. Why did you not go back again to Paris?
Because I am not able to go there; I cannot get away from here at all.

2061. Are you married?
Yes.

2062. Have you got a family?
No family.

2063. What are your average earnings per week?
Not much. I should say at the utmost 10*s.* or 12*s.* a week; but I am not sure.

2064. Do you mean 10*s.* or 12*s.* in good times, or all the year round?
There is not much of good times during the year. I can only point out four weeks when I earn 30*s.* or 32*s.*

2065. For about four weeks in the year?
Yes, and the rest of the year I get 12*s.* or 15*s.* or 18*s.*, or 8*s.* or 5*s.* or 4*s.*, and sometimes I have nothing; for three or four weeks nothing. I am in the bespoke work now.

2066. During that time when you have no work in your trade, I suppose you have no other work to do?
I do not do anything else.

2067. Have you to go to the shop, although you have got no work to do?
I must go to the shop.

2068. In case some work may come in?
Yes; in case there is a coat or two to be made.

2069. How many people are there in the same shop with you?
It is only a shop with people coming over for four or six months; there are eight in it now.

2070. All men?
Seven men and one girl.

2071. What work does the girl do?
Finishing up coats.

2072. What hours do you keep when you have work?
There are not regular hours; sometimes I come in at six o'clock and I have to work right off 22 hours, 20 hours or 18 hours, because it is piecework.

2073. Do you mean that you have ever worked 22 hours at a stretch?
I have at times. Once I went in at six o'clock on the Thursday morning and worked all night, and only left off at ten o'clock the next evening, Friday evening.

2074. That does not happen often?
No, not often; sometimes.

2075. Do you often work as long as 18 hours in a day?
Seventeen and 16 hours; and 18 hours at times.

2076. Does the girl work the same length of time?
No, the girl does not work the same time.

2077. She goes home?
Yes,

2078. How long does she work?
She works sometimes till nine o'clock or half-past eight, and sometimes she leaves off at eight o'clock.

2079. From what time in the morning; when does she begin?
Sometimes she comes in at five or six o'clock in the morning; if it is very busy with us she is obliged to come in at five o'clock or six o'clock in the morning.

2080. And work till eight or nine o'clock at night?
Yes, on Thursday night sometimes she must stop till eleven or half-past eleven; but not every night; only if it is a very busy time with us.

2081. When you work these long hours, 18 or 20 or even 22 hours, do you have any time allowed you for meals?
No; I must stop in the workshop till I have finished with my work; I must not go anywhere in this place where I have been working.

2082. You take your meals while you are working?
I take my meals where I am working.

2083. And are you supplied with coffee in the morning?
In this place where I have been working I have not been supplied with coffee in the morning.

2084. Nothing?
No.

2085. And you find your own food?
Yes, I find my own food.

2086. What food do you generally have?
Tea and bread; sometimes I buy a pennyworth of ale, half a pint of ale; not always?

2087. I suppose it depends upon whether you are earning good wages or not?
Yes.

2088. Have you worked for many masters?
Yes.

2089. How many?
About 10 or 12 I should say, since I have been here.

2090. Have

2090. Have you been in any large workshops?
Some of them were large.

2091. How many men were in the largest?
Twenty-five or 30.

2092. And how many in the smallest?
About two or three.

2093. Were you any better off in the large shops that had 20 or 25, than you were in the small ones?
I was better off in the large workshops than in the small ones.

2094. In what way?
Because in a large workshop I go in the morning at eight o'clock, and leave off at ten o'clock, and I get paid my wages on Friday when I leave off working. In the small workshop I have to go in early in the morning and leave off late at night; even if I have three coats to do, I must go in and stop from five o'clock in the morning till I am done, and I might be done at eleven o'clock.

2095. Are the larger shops more comfortable, more airy, and more decent?
Yes.

2096. Have wages gone down since you have been in the trade?
No.

2097. Do you earn as good wages now as you did when you first came over 16 years ago?
The wages are higher now than they were at that time.

2098. Are they higher now than they were 10 years ago?
At that time I had a whole week's work, but now I have only two days or three days, or a half-day.

2099. What I want to know is do you get more now for finishing a coat than you got for finishing the same coat 10 years ago?
The same wages on piece-work, namely, 1 *s.*, 1 *s.* 3 *d.*, and 1 *s.* 6 *d.* a coat.

2100. What are you paid now?
One shilling a coat, for one kind of coat.

2101. Were you paid 1 *s.* a coat 15 or 16 years ago?
One shilling, 1 *s.* 3 *d.*, and 1 *s.* 6 *d.*, and just now it is the same wages in the bespoke work.

2102. Do any of the men working in the shop with you make more than you can?
No, they do not earn more than I do.

2103. How many coats can you finish in a day?
Six or seven, or eight, that is machining only.

2104. You can machine seven or eight coats in a day?
Yes.

2105. Do you know any workmen who can machine more?
Yes, there are some men who if they work day and night can do more.

2106. But in the same number of hours I mean?
Yes, there are some who can do more in the same number of hours.

2107. Lord *Thring.*] How many more?
They could do one coat more.

2108. *Chairman.*] And I suppose there are some that could not do so many?
Some could not do so many.

2109. Do you belong to any of these unions?
I do belong to the London Tailors and Machinists' Society.

2110. How long have you been a member of it?
Two years.

2111. Do you know at all whether men have been discharged by the masters for becoming members of these associations?
No.

2112. Do you know at all why it is that there has been sometimes so much difficulty in getting the workmen to combine together and join the association?
The difficulty is because they are afraid to combine together; masters do not like to have it; they do not like to have society men from this society to work.

2113. But you have just told me that you have never heard of an instance of a man being discharged for that reason; why is it that men are afraid of joining the association?
If I belong to the society I must not say at all that I belong to this society or else the sweaters would not take me in at all.

2114. But they would not discharge you, would they, for belonging to it?
They would discharge me, because when I came back last Tuesday I had another machiner in my place. I do not know whether any one has been sacked for joining a society up to this time.

2115. At any rate you think that men are afraid of joining these societies from fear they should not be able to get work?
I think so.

2116. Were you discharged because you came here on Tuesday, or because you could not do your work on that day?
I think it was because the employer knew I was coming here.

2117. Now tell me something about these "greeners"; are they mostly "greeners" in the shop where you are working?
They are.

2118. Have you worked in many shops where there were many "greeners" working?
I have been in many shops where they work.

2119. And do you think they are the cause of wages being so low, and hours so long?
It is the cause.

2120. You think that if there were not so many "greeners" you would be better off?
Yes.

2121. Lord *Thring.*] When you came over in 1872 you were a "greener?"
In 1872 I was a "greener."

2122. Do you think it would have been right that you should not have been allowed to work in 1872?
No, I would not have liked that.

2123. But you would like a man, who comes over as a "greener" now, to be sent away?
I do not complain or ask that he should be sent away; I do not say he should be sent away.

2124. But you would like him not to be employed?
I do not think so. I say only that the bad pay is because of the "greeners."

2125. But then I thought you said that you did not wish that the "greeners" should be employed, because they injured the trade?
I did not say so.

2126. You are quite willing that they should come, and be employed?
I have nothing to lose; they can come, and be employed.

2127. Lord

2127. Lord *Monkswell.*] I should like to know about those 40 hours that you worked on one occasion; how did you prevent yourself from going to sleep all those 40 hours?

I did not sleep at all; I can prove it, by the name of Mr. Landau, that I was working all those number of hours.

2128. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Why do you have so much work to do on Thursday?

Because all the work comes in on Wednesday, this particular kind of work, and we had to do all the work on Thursday night, because they do not work on Friday night and Saturday, and we have to finish the work on Friday evening.

2129. You do not know why it is that the work comes in on Wednesday, except that it is the custom?

Yes.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. ARNOLD HENRY WHITE, having been re-called; is further Examined, as follows:

2130. *Chairman.*] I WANT to call your attention to your answer to Question 1316, in which you say, speaking of the shirt evidence: "With the exception of the shirt all the garments that have been exhibited are slop clothing, and the sweating system is, I believe, absolutely restricted to that form of the clothing trade which deals with slop clothing, Government clothing, or what may be called contract work, such as military, railway, and police uniforms." I understand that some Members of the Committee would like to ask you for information upon that point?

I shall be happy to answer any questions that may be put to me.

2131. Earl of *Onslow.*] I should like to ask you whether you are aware as to what Government clothing is made, subject to the Factory Clause, and what Government clothing is not so made; me you aware that till quite recently the police clothing was made under a contract which did not contain any Factory Clause?

I have been so informed.

2132. And are you aware that the volunteer clothing is arranged for by the commanding officers of the volunteers and not by a Government department?

I am aware of that.

2133. Do you know at all what proportion of the whole of the Government contracts are put out in the East-end of London?

I have not the papers here which would enable me to answer that question.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Tuesday next, Twelve o'clock.

Die Martis, 1° *Maii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of CANTERBURY.
Earl of DERBY.
Earl of ONSLOW.
Viscount GORDON (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord CLINTON.
Lord KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord ROTHSCHILD.
Lord MONKSWELL.
Lord THRING.

LORD KENRY (EARL OF DUNRAVEN AND MOUNT-EARL), IN THE CHAIR.

MR. ARNOLD HENRY WHITE, having been called in; is further Examined, as follows:

2134. *Chairman.*] YOU have some information relative to the cabinet-making trade that you wish to give to the Committee?
Yes.

2135. I understand that you will be occupied before the Committee of the House of Commons on Emigration and Immigration for the next week or two, and that, therefore, it would be convenient for you if we broke off from examining the persons in the tailoring trade, and heard your evidence now about the cabinet-making trade?
Yes. The cabinet trade is one that is very scattered, and the connection of the cabinet trade, which includes upholstery or soft work, with the sweating system, is the prevalence of sub-contracting, which is a practice new partly since 1855, but more especially since 1880, which your Lordships will observe is again the date when pauper immigration first began to be virulent. The trade being scattered in different parts of London, and much sub-contracted, it lends itself, as I shall explain, to a continual fall in wages and deterioration in the work. The custom of the trade is this: When a customer goes to a furniture firm to get an article or enter into a contract for furniture, the furniture firm would supply him with a sketch or sketches, which he would approve. The sketch when made is sent round to be tendered for by the trade working shops, that is, the sweating shops. The articles made by the sweating shops are sent home to the customer as the work of the great shop, and often bear the stamp of the great shop as being their own manufacture. If anything goes wrong with the work, men are sent who have to bear out the statement that the furniture was made at the great shop; and I shall read your Lordships a statement made to me by a man named Hole, bearing out this fact. These trade working shops, as they are sometimes called, not infrequently give out the work again to other people, many of whom have begun to employ boy labour. The impulse given to the sweating system by these sub-contracts is accelerated by the habit of employing boy labour in operations involving merely mechanical skill, where the boy has to perform over and over again one mechanical detail, and he never acquires anything else outside his operation. But the sweating system, so far as it does exist in the cabinet trade, is still further aided by the practice on the part of some of the great shops, both in Tottenham-court-road and the Curtain-road, of paying the trade working shop the price of the goods

 delivered

delivered, only under a discount, varying from 2½ to 20 per cent., payment sometimes being deferred on Saturday afternoons until the bank is closed, and as the men require the money not only for household purposes but for paying the wages of the employés who have been engaged on turning out the work, they have no option but to take the reduced value of their work. A man named Miller, who has been ruined by this system, will be called; also Mr. Baum; also Mr. Parnell, who was the object of an action for libel by the firm of Maple. Mr. Parnell stated that Maple was a sweater of the sweaters. A committee was formed in defence of Mr. Parnell, and Mr. Parnell will tell you that the action brought was withdrawn, although he is, of course, a man of no capital. Sometimes these cheques are taken to a public house, the proprietor of which cashes the amount, either at a discount, or in consideration of cigars, beer, wine, spirits forming part of the change given for the cheque. There is one public-house at the end of the Curtain-road, "The London Apprentice," where very large numbers of cheques are changed, and where I have seen that operation going on, on more than one occasion. Now, as an instance, and as a specific statement on the question of sub-contracting, I am informed, taking one of the largest houses in the trade, that Maple employs Gifford and Ley; Gifford and Ley employ Phemister, and a boy works for Phemister. A witness is present, Mr. Parnell, who will speak of a case with four contractors intervening between the original worker and the purchaser. The effect of giving out this work on a scale of ever reducing prices is that the work is scamped. If your Lordships would look at this piece of oak veneer, 44 thicknesses of which go to the inch, you will observe the character of the British oak furniture, which is maintaining our name at home and abroad (*handing in a specimen*).

2136. What is that put on to?
On to a table.

2137. What kind of wood?
That is oak; it is put on to deal, white wood; that is 44 thicknesses to the inch, and it sometimes goes down to 64 thicknesses.

2138. Lord *Clinton.*] Is that sold as solid oak?
That is sold as oak furniture.

2139. Lord *Thring.*] But in selling that as oak furniture, is it understood in the trade that it means oak throughout, or only that the veneer at the top is oak?
It is not understood in the trade as being solid oak.

2140. Is a customer given to believe that it is solid oak?
I should think a good many customers would believe that it is solid oak.

2141. It is only veneered at the top?
At all the edges.

2142. Underneath the table it would not be veneered?
It would not be. I have seen it, certainly, veneered all over, so that you could not tell.

2143. Earl of *Onslow.*] If it were sold as solid oak, would not the vendor be liable to a prosecution for fraud?
The buyer would have his remedy, undoubtedly. As I was observing, the effect of giving out this work on a scale of ever-reducing prices, is that the work is scamped; and evidence will be brought forward to show the deterioration of cabinet work as compared with 20 years ago, especially since 1811. There are houses in the trade who have acquired a good name for excellent work and thoroughly good materials. The second hand furniture of some of these houses fetched a higher price than the new furniture of some so to say first class firms now existing. There are some shops in the trade, such as Howards, and Collinson and Lock, who are said to do the work themselves. This ensures a better quality of workmanship than the system of buying in or sub-contracting, which is almost identical with the sub-contract system in the boot trade. The cabinet trade is that which furnishes the interior of a house with hard and soft

soft goods. The upholstering is generally referred to as soft work. Taking the upholstery trade, sweating enters into that branch in the following manner: There are three classes of work; there is the first-class work done by good firms on their own premises by their own workmen, and which is what it represents itself to be. There is the second-class work, given out by the great firms, done by piece-masters, many of whom are in the neighbourhood of Tottenham Court-road. These men employ boys in the mechanical operations and cheap labour, and in the case of Bethnal Green, many foreigners. Work turned out in this way is often sold as first-class work. The third-class work is the cheap work made for working-men's homes, such as the easy chairs sold at 14 *s.* 6 *d.*; and this third-class work is where most of the misery connected with the cabinet trade exists. Now the apprenticeship system in the cabinet trade has had a marked effect on the character of that trade. Boys are now indentured for three or five years; no premium is paid; and as they receive wages at the rate of 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a week for the first year, 5 *s.* for the second, 10 *s.* for the third, 15 *s.* for the fourth, and 20 *s.* for the fifth, parents are extremely glad to get their boys into such situations. But what is the result? At the end of this period of indenture the boys have learnt but one sub-section of the trade, and are unfit to enter an upholsterer's shop and do the all-round or entire work. Just as we found that the master knifer was no longer a bootmaker, that the presser or the baster was no longer a tailor, so you find in the upholstery trade that the lads at the end of their indentures, although they have been earning 1 *l.* per week, make their exit from their indentures unfit and unequipped with the all-round knowledge of the trade that apprentices did acquire at the beginning of the century. The obvious result is that they cannot obtain employment in ordinary shops until they have acquired somehow experience in other branches of the work. This system is but six or seven years old; and again I ask your Lordships to mark the date, the close connection it had with this fatal year of 1880. It involves great sub-division of labour, and a continued stream of fresh boys who are generally discharged at the end of their indentures. The consequence of the trade being flooded with cheap mechanical labour of this description is that the masters have obtained almost complete control and dominion over labour. The unions are weak, and, just as in the boot trade and the tailoring trade, the continual inrush of cheap labour prevents the formation of those strong unions which are the safeguards of the men against the greed or the ambition of the employer. The masters having thus obtained complete control over labour, numerous cases of injustice occur. Added to this, the effect of the continued fall in prices has been to produce much distress among both men and women; and, in the opinion of some witnesses who will be called, the lowness of women's wages drives them, from want, to lead lives of shame. I am told that this is not done openly and in such a form as would lend itself to statistics, but the amateur and secret means of eking out low wages, I have every reason to believe, from many sources of information, to be on the increase. Summing up the effect of this flow of unskilled labour, the result has reduced the aggregate earnings in a trade where there is no machine labour (I am speaking of the upholstery), and where there is no foreign labour in the soft work. This book (*producing a manuscript book*) is a book of the wages of the father of one of the witnesses, 22 years ago. I need not go into the details; but no man in this trade could earn these prices now; and it is interesting, as showing authoritatively the difference between the earnings of a man 22 years ago and that man's son now; he himself will speak of it. Mr. Baum will speak of it. Further, this employment of boy labour has created the same class of irregularity of work, of which your Lordships have heard in the previous trades. It is said that in Gillows, a first rate house, most of the men have been on half-time for a year. It is obvious from this that the immigration of unskilled labour into the upholstery trade is far in excess of its requirements. Now, with regard to foreigners, going back as far as the Exhibition of 1851, Germans came in and introduced spring stuffing and buttoning, and this revolutionised the upholstery trade. These Germans formed a society of their own, and they were accustomed to work in secret, in rooms by themselves. They earned large wages

so long as their secret was undiscovered; but when it leaked out, not only did the superiority of the Germans disappear, but that generation, the men themselves, gradually vanished, and there is now no German society in the upholstery trade. At the present time it is said that we beat the whole of the Continent in first rate upholstery; and in the Exhibition of 1878, in Paris, the English chairs beat everything. I am speaking now, of course, of the top of the trade. What is called French work is not French work, but was introduced by Nosotti. Foreigners do not exist at the present time in any numbers in the upholstery trade. The greeners have affected only the lower part, the sediment, of the cabinet; of the hard work. The result of this fall of prices, and of the great immigration into the trade of boys, and the consequent mastery of the employers, has been that the masters have great power of selection, and of late years men over 40 are considered too old for re-engagement. Last year, I am informed, two firms, Messrs. Boyd and Morant, and Messrs. Johnson and Norman, issued an order that no men were to be engaged over 40. Some large houses stamp as their own manufacturing goods not made by them, but which are made in garrets, or in the workmen's home, for them. The conditions of the lives of the workers, so far as I have been able to get at the facts, do not show, as a whole, that they are very degraded, or that the hours are by any means so prolonged as the hours in the boot trade and tailoring trade; but the process of degradation, by the diminution of earning and the lengthening of hours, is perceptibly on the increase. As an instance of the fall in value, a bedroom suite which fetched 140 *l.* in 1880 only fetches 100 *l.* now. As a proof of the decreased employment of men by firms, I adduce the following few instances: Messrs. Holland and Sons, 15 years ago, I am informed, employed from 70 to 80 men, now they employ about six; Gillows employed 70 to 80, now 18; Banting's employed 30 to 40, now two; Crace's employed 20, now eight; Jackson and Graham have amalgamated with Collinson and Lock, and Wright and Mansfield have gone out of existence. This firm was remarkable for good work at the French Exhibition of 1851, and I believe a cabinet is now shown in the South Kensington Museum, as an example of first-rate work at that period. Gregory's employed 40 to 50, they now average about nine. Now, as to the cost of making goods, in 1811 a statement of prices, accepted as the standard price, was arranged between a committee of masters and men. A Pembroke table, as made for the Government by Howard, then rewarded labour with 5 *s.* 4½ *d.*; for this very table, the same pattern, the workman now gets 3 *s.*

2144. *Chairman.*] Do you know what proportion the wages bear to the rest of the cost of production?

The start, as they call it, according to pattern, is 11 *s.* 6 *d.*; if it is 12 inches extra length, 3 *s.* 3 *d.* more; if the width is increased 9 inches, 1 *s.* 10½ *d.* more. The whole cost of the materials, with 20 per cent. on, came to 1 *l.* 1 *s.* 7 *d.*, the wages for labour to 5 *s.* 4½ *d.* For this very table the workmen are now paid 3 *s.*

2145. You have given us the cost of production in 1811, and the wages; you have not given us the cost of material now?

No, I have not got that here. Now I am informed that Howard & Sons, Berners-street, which I believe has retained a good deal of its own manufacturing, does a considerable amount of work for the Government; and one of the jobs they make is this very table I am speaking of, the price of which, according to the rate fixed by the joint committee of workmen and employers was 17 *s.* 6 *d.*; that is the start price. Since then two separate 10 per cent. advances have been agreed to by the employers and workmen, and these, added to the 17 *s.* 6 *d.*, would make the price that should be paid at present for the table rather over 21 *s.* This should be the price for it if made by hand; but the firm in question has a large plant of first-class wood working machinery; so, allowing a deduction of 75 per cent., which is ample, that would then leave 5 *s.* 3 *d.* as the price which ought to be paid for it. But the price actually paid, as I have said, is 3 *s.* A first class and exceptionally quick man, by working like a slave, might possibly make an average of two in a day of 10 hours. They are given out 10 in a set, and these 10 have to be so made that when they are put side by side with the flaps up, they

they shall be level, so that they may be used as one large table. A man, therefore who could make two in a day would be working for nearly 2 *d.* an hour less than the recognised wages of the trade; he would be working for 7 *d.* instead of for 9 *d.* Now with regard to the general condition of the cabinet trade in Bethnal Green, I have had great difficulty in getting at the facts, first, of course, because the workshops are not under any Factory Act, and their men can work to any hour they like; they employ women and girls, and nobody ever thinks of visiting them. But I am informed that the depression there has arisen chiefly from the importation of Polish and German Jews. I may mention to your Lordships that I have some men watching at the docks, and two ships arrived last week; and on Sunday night one ship arrived with 150, and another at the Tilbury Docks with 57; so that on Sunday night 207 arrived, between midnight on Sunday and six o'clock on Monday morning, which I venture to think is a confutation of the evidence given by Mr. Stephany.

2146. Earl of *Onslow.*] Do you mean midnight on Saturday?

No, 12 midnight on Sunday, six hours. I have the names and addresses, and destinations of many of these people, but I do not propose to put them in here, as they will be used in another place. Many of these greeners are for the first three or four months after their arrival kept on the premises, or close by, and they work 12 or 14 hours, at the average rate of from 10 *s.* to 13 *s.* a week. When they have improved in their work, and they find out how they have been treated, disturbances are very apt to occur, and these disturbances seem to me to contain all the seeds of a "juden hetze" in the East End. I do not know whether it is out of order to express a strong opinion here on the subject; but this feeling against the foreigners is growing. I am receiving extraordinary assistance from English born people who never heard my name, and do not know anything about me, simply from the intense bitterness which is arising in most of the trades against this importation of paupers from other countries; and although it has only comparatively slightly affected the cabinet trade, it is beginning to affect it. Now, most of these greeners leave, if they can get away, and seek some other employment; some of them become bootmakers, and some of them tailors; some of them become hawkers in Petticoat-lane and the clothes market, and in Goulston-street, and that part. A great many of these greeners, Hungarians and Poles, who have been engaged in the cabinet trade, may be seen as hawkers. Some of them make a start for themselves, and get some of their newly-imported countrymen under them, and treat them in the same way as they have been treated, and by so doing are able to sell their goods at far less than the cost of good work and materials. In some cases those in charge of the imported foreigners have offered English employers a bonus to take them on, thereby doing great injury to the English workmen.

2147. Earl of *Derby.*] When you say to take them on, do you mean to take them into employment?

To take them into employment.

2148. Lord *Thring.*] Who offered a bonus?

The relations; the people who have charge of these greeners who have come over. They come over in batches, and they go to their relations, and their relations want to get them into employment as soon as they can.

2149. You mean their relations in London?

Yes, in London.

2150. Do you mean that the relations offer a sum of money in respect of a particular man that he should be taken into employment?

Yes, precisely, as your Lordships had evidence about the man who paid 5 *s.* in order to be taken on by the knifer; only it is not nearly so far spread in the cabinet trade as it is in the bootmaking trade; but here is the beginning of it.

2151. Earl of *Derby.*] You spoke of the foreigners just now as paupers; do you mean that they come upon the rates?

No. I adhere to the definition that I gave to a noble Lord in reply to a

question, that a pauper is a man who is likely to become a public or private charge.

2152. That is a possible pauper in the future?
It is a potential pauper.

2153. Lord *Clinton.*] As a matter of fact they do not come on the rates?
That would be a public charge.

2154. But we understood, I think, that as a matter of fact these foreigners do not go upon the rates?
They do not go on the rates further than to the extent I stated, namely, that in Whitechapel last year there were 376. Of course many are helped by the Jewish Board of Guardians, and many obtain temporary assistance for a fortnight at the House of Shelter in London-street. I may say that I am a subscriber to that House of Shelter, and my agent is now refused admission to examine these men as they come in, so that I am not able to speak up to within the last few days as accurately as I should like to do.

2155. Earl of *Onslow.*] But if a man came upon the Jewish Board of Guardians, you would call that a pauper becoming a private charge?
Yes, I would go beyond that; I would say if he causes an Englishman to be put out of work, and to come upon the rates, for national purposes, he is as much a pauper as the Englishman.

2156. Earl of *Derby.*] A man who displaces another you call a pauper?
If he is a pauper himself, or a cause of pauperism in others.

2157 Lord *Thring.*] Do you mean that these foreigners force Englishmen upon the rates?
That is my contention; that they edge them out.

2158. But suppose I succeed in business by forcing out somebody else who is inferior to me, am I thereby made a pauper?
Does your Lordship mean a business in which manual labour, a mechanical operation, is employed?

2159. Yes; do you call me a potential pauper because I may by my greater skill force another man out of the business, and make him a pauper?
Skill does not come in here, merely physical fitness.

2160. Then suppose I, by working harder than another man, force that other man out of employment, am I thereby made a potential pauper?
If your Lordship were a Chinaman you would be such an evil that I should take steps to prevent that happening.

2161. If I am a Chinaman, supposing I am not on the public rates, or on private charity, am I a potential pauper?
No, you are not a potential pauper, but you are precisely the same thing; you are such an evil that you should be suppressed.

2162. Earl of *Onslow.*] Would it not sum it up to say a potential pauper or a cause of pauperism?
Yes.

2163. Lord *Sandhurst.*] You mean that they produce this result by "scabbing" the work?
Yes, not by skill; but where mere physical fitness is the only qualification. The displacing of a man who has contributed to the strength and revenue of his country by any one who does not contribute either by taxation or by joining the services, or in any other way, whether that is pauperism itself or merely the cause of pauperism, is such an evil as warrants in my humble opinion a very marked and prompt intervention by the State.

2164. Earl of *Derby.*] You say, "does not contribute to taxation"?
I do. If a working man does not drink spirits, and does not smoke tobacco, and does not drink tea, he does not contribute to taxation.

2165. Would

2165. Would not all teatotallers and non-smokers come under the same condemnation?

Not necessarily; because teatotallers and non-smokers may have other virtues and qualifications which these people have not. For instance, Cardinal Manning is a teatotaller and a non-smoker; he certainly would not come under that condemnation. No matter how many hours it takes for a miserable pittance, the work comes out (I am speaking of this Curtain-road work) at 2½ *d.* and under per hour. I am going to read your Lordships now a very short statement of 16 or 17 actual cases which have been collected during the last week. An article appeared in the "Standard" a few weeks ago (on the 4th of this month), describing a starving trade. I need not read that article, but it might be put in, as it is an accurate description of the manner in which these poor men hawk their goods on Saturday night about the town, selling them to furniture dealers at starvation prices (*handing in the article*). My friends who are assisting me in this matter, have, during the last week, collected these cases of sweating. The first is that of a small master employing seven or eight men, who has moved with the times, and is now employing foreigners at a low rate. Here is his name and address, but I do not want to put it in; it might injure the man if the names were given. It is a valuable instance of drifting to the inevitable. He allows his son, just grown up, to sub-contract for the work. He employs one foreigner and one Englishman, paying the Englishman 4 *d.* an hour and the foreigner 3½ *d.* an hour. A second case (it is No. 6 in my list) is that of a man in the toilet-table trade, which is one by itself; he had all foreigners in his shop, and paid them from 14 *s.* to 16 *s.* a week. One of these tables, well made, would cost from 5 *l.* to 7 *l* retail, according to the material used. No. 7 eight years ago used to work for wages, and gained a knowledge of the trade. He left and started in a shed in Fox's-buildings, taking on as workmen men who were nearly all imported foreigners; I mean Poles, and Russians, and Germans, who had to do so much work for 10 *s.* a week, quitting the hour system altogether; after some experience, rising to 11 *s.*, 12 *s.*, or 13 *s.* a week, and working from early morning to late at night, and day after day; for food, eating bread and treacle, and keeping on work during the dinner-time (exactly as in the case of the bootmaking), dipping their bread into the treacle and eating it while at work. After some months these workmen found that No. 7, who, I may say to his dishonour, is an Englishman (they are all Englishmen), was robbing them, and they left him, their places being taken by newly-imported Polish Jews, who were brought from somewhere (I think I know the somewhere) in the Commercial-road. This man then started on his own account, employing these foreigners (greeners) who could not work dove-tailing where required, but nailed where dove-tailing is usually done, making very discreditable work; the class of work which has done much injury to the trade. His polishing shops are as defective as his cabinet shop; but the polish makes his wood look very pleasing to the eye for the moment, but will not bear a strict examination. On inquiry it turned out that his bed-room suites cost him from 2 *l.* 10 *s.* to 4 *l.*, for which he charges from 9 *l.* to 16 *l.*; the cost of the drawing-room suites being from 1 *l.* to 3 *l.*, for which he charges from 3 *l.* 10 *s.* to 9 *l.* 10 *s.*, and some of them 12 *l.* and 13 *l.* He now pays those who have stayed with him from 12 *s.* to 17 *s.* a week, and those who work piece-work can earn 18 *s.*

2166. Lord *Monkswell.*] Is this the total cost, including the labour?

Yes; the larger amounts I have given include the labour and materials. Now, a word about these men who work all the week and hawk their goods round in barrows, or sometimes, as in the case of a witness now in the room, an old man of 67 (67 to-morrow, the 2nd of May), they have no barrow, but have to carry their bit of furniture round on their heads. This table (*pointing to a table*) was sold retail to me for 6 *s.* 9 *d.* to-day. The man who made it sells it for 4 *s.* 6 *d.* to the shop, and out of that 4 *s.* 6 *d.*, 3 *s.* 6 *d.* goes for materials, leaving him 1 *s.* for making it, the profit to the retailer being the difference between the 4 *s.* 6 *d.* and the 6 *s.* 9 *d.*, namely, 2 *s.* 3 *d.* Now the dealers who buy these goods in this way, various firms in Curtain-road and Great Eastern-street, are in the habit of taking percentages off the low prices given to the men who hawk their goods in this way; and sometimes in cases where goods have been ordered

by so well-known a firm as Maple, a witness will tell your Lordships, under a full sense of responsibity, of this practice of discounts being taken off the prices agreed to be paid for the goods; a very serious statement to make, and I should not venture to repeat it, even under the protection of your Lordships, but for the fact that I have severally and individually examined seven men as to the truth of this, and they are men of character and reputation; and a man, who himself was ruined by it, is in the room, and will give evidence for himself.

2167. Earl of *Onslow.*] Will you explain it a little more fully?

A man agrees to make a table for Collinson and Lock for a pound, and when he takes the table home on Saturday afternoon he gets a cheque given him, but the bank is closed, and he has to pay his men, and he has to get his household supplies for the Sunday, and he cannot get the cheque cashed when the employer who has agreed to pay him the pound says, "I will cash my cheque for you, but you must take off 2½, or 5, or" (as Miller will tell you) "as much as 20 per cent."; when the man is so greatly in need that he has no option of refusing; and that is the point where the sweating enters in in the cabinet trade.

2168. *Chairman.*] They take discount for cashing their own cheques, as I understand you?

Yes.

2169. Lord *Thring.*] I understand it to be this: I give a particular man a cheque, and I give it so late that he cannot get it cashed?

Yes.

2170. If he could get it cashed there would be no complaint?

No, of course not.

2171. If I give it so late that he cannot get it cashed on that particular night, he could get it cashed on the Monday morning, I presume?

I presume so.

2172. Therefore you allege that for the loan, practically, during the Sunday the employer charges this large percentage?

That is the allegation.

2173. *Chairman.*] Are they always paid in cheques?

At some firms always.

2174. I suppose some of these witnesses who are coming before us will be able to explain this a little more in detail?

Yes, fully.

2175. Lord *Thring.*] They will also explain why they cannot get it cashed elsewhere?

They can get it cashed at the public house; but the banks are closed on Saturday afternoon. I have here a list of the men who take off 2½ per cent.; I do not know that there is any object in publishing them. Now here are facts seen in Curtain-road and Great Eastern-street on Saturday, 28th April 1888, between the hours of 12 noon and 5.30, p.m. (I am indebted for this to Mr. Harold Boulton of the Oxford House in Bethnal Green). No. 9: Six bedroom washstands; the cost of material 5 *s.*, and of labour 6 *s.*, making together 11 *s.*; after three hours in the road had to let them go for 7 *s.* (the cost of labour is taken at 6 *d.* an hour), making a loss of 4 *s.* No. 10: Four small tables, cost of material 9 *s.*, cost of labour 8 *s.*, total 17 *s.*; he had to sell them for 11 *s.* 6 *d.* or take them back again, losing 5 *s.* 6 *d.* No. 11: Two large drawing-room tables; cost of materials, 2 *l.* 15 *s.*; cost of labour (taking it at only 6 *d.* an hour, the trade rate being 9 *d.* throughout) 1 *l.* 15 *s.*; total 4 *l.* 10 *s.* He sold one for 1 *l.* 18 *s.*, and one for 1 *l.* 16 *s.*, losing 16 *s.* out of his labour. No. 12: Two sofas, and lady and gentleman's chairs; cost of material 15 *s.*; one week's labour 1 *l.* 4 *s.*, making 1 *l.* 19 *s.* altogether. He was offered 18 *s.*, 21 *s.*, and 25 *s.*, and had to let them go for 27 *s.*, losing 12 *s.* No. 13: One suite of drawing-room furniture; cost of material 1 *l.* 8 *s.* 6 *d.*; 55 hours' labour,

labour, 1 *l.* 7 *s.* 6 *d.*; total 2 *l.* 16 *s.*; sold them for 2 *l.* 4 *s.*, losing 12 *s.*, or had to take them back. No. 14: Two chiffonniers; cost of material 1 *l.* 11 *s.*; labour 1 *l.* 2 *s.*, making together 2 *l.* 13 *s.*; after two and a half hours in the road, he had to take them back or sell them for 2 *s.* 2 *s.*, a loss of 11 *s.* No. 15: Two mahogany tables, cost of material 19 *s.*, cost of labour 6 *s.*, making together 25 *s.*; was offered 9 *s.* 6 *d.* each, and after various trials, sold them for 11 *s.*; that is, 22 *s.* for the two, losing the sum of 3 *s.*

2176. *Chairman.*] I understand these are cases where men have been unfortunate in disposing of their goods?

They are cases which are so numerous that it is a practice; it is a type.

2177. I do not clearly understand. In the first place, are these orders executed?

No; these are the little men who work in their own places, their own little unvisited workshops, themselves, who sell what they make to the larger shops, sometimes with orders, sometimes without orders. When they have no orders they have to go on working, getting the wood very often on credit, and hoping to sell in the Curtain-road, or thereabouts, and very often they have to go to a place called the slaughter-house.

2178. These cases you mention are not cases of goods that were executed in accordance with orders?

I do not know.

2179. I understand then that these men made these goods to sell in the ordinary way, and that they were unable to get anything like what they considered a sufficient price for them?

They could only get a starvation price.

2180. And you consider that there are a great number of such cases?

A great many.

2181. Lord *Thring.*] Your object is to prove that these hawkers have hard lives?

I want to go a little behind that; I want to prove out of this the constant saturation of the lower branches of these trades by boy labour and by greeners.

2182. Earl of *Onslow.*] You do not allege that this arises in any way out of the sub-contract or sweating system as we know it?

Yes; I allege that they are being sweated in selling at this price; I do not say it is a sweating that you can reach by any possible legislation.

2183. *Chairman.*] Am I to understand that you are going to give the causes, or are you merely giving us certain facts which come to your knowledge?

I am giving you certain facts, and I hope to connect them with the saturation of the lower branches of these different trades by boy labour and with he greeners.

2184. Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] You give them to us as fair specimens of the condition to which these labourers are reduced?

Absolutely fair specimens.

2185. *Chairman.*] We may take what you have given to be fair samples of the general condition of that portion of the trade?

Yes. I have one or two special cases. One is this: two 6-foot mahogany sideboards, with cupboard backs; total cost, including labour, 13 *l.* 7 *s.* 6 *d.*; was offered 9 *l.* for them by a Curtain-road house; refused it, and could not sell anywhere that day, the 14th of this month; being pressed for cash he tried again next day, and a buyer went to see them, offering 10 *l.*; after considerable cavilling and haggling he advanced 10 *s.*, making 10 *l.* 10 *s.*, which was accepted, being a loss of 2 *l.* 17 *s.* 6 *d.*

2186. Lord *Rothschild.*] When you say a loss, you mean a reduction in the price of his labour?

I do. If the recognised trade rate is 9 *d.* an hour, and I have only taken it all through here at 6 *d.*, I think it is a fair inference that what works out below that 6 *d.* is a loss; it is a loss to somebody, and to whom but the man. Now,

I spoke, in the beginning of my statement, of cases where great firms are addicted to the practice of treating as their own goods goods that are not made by them, and this practice seems to be a great injustice to the actual workers.

2187. Earl of *Onslow.*] Just explain the word "treating"; do you mean marking them with their names?

Stamping them. For instance, this table might be stamped Collinson and Lock, and might be made by some piece-working shop in Curtain-road.

2188. Earl of *Derby.*] When an article of furniture is stamped in that way, is it understood in the trade and by the public to mean that it is made by the house in question, or only that they guarantee it?

Your Lordship says "by the trade and by the public." I should say, no, it is not understood by the trade that it is made by that house; but I should say it is understood by the public that it is made by that house.

2189. Lord *Thring.*] But you are aware that the stamp very often denotes the seller and not the maker?

I am going to put before your Lordships an instance of what happens. Certain furniture was made for Baron Edmund de Rothschild in France. A man named Holl makes this statement to me: He was engaged by a man named Hughes making a fireplace and overmantel in satin for the château of Baron Edmund de Rothschild, in France, to which he was sent on the 4th October 1885, with another man named Bottière, a foreigner, for the fixing of the furniture mentioned. When they reached the château they saw many other men who were doing different parts of furnishing and decorating, and who were all foreigners, working for London firms who contracted to do the work for Maple. They were not any of Maple's men, and all that did belong to Maple was a van which had conveyed some of the furniture. When Holl and Bottière arrived at the château they were unable, for the first two days, to fix the fireplace and overmantel, as they had not come, and Baron Rothschild coming in on the second day, and seeing that they were not working, asked them why. On their explaining that the furniture they were to fix had not yet arrived, he asked why they did not help other men in fixing the other furniture. They replied that they did not come from the same firm, and had been sent over by Hughes to fix the above furniture only. When Mr. Ball, the manager of Maple's, visited the château to see how the work was going on, and heard from Mr. Peterson, who was regarded as the foreman, that the Baron had been told by Bottière that he and Holl were not assisting the other men, because they did not come from the same firm, he was very indignant, and told the men that they must consider themselves as all working for Maple, and had no business to tell Baron Rothschild they did not work for the same firm as some of the other men. From this time until their stuff arrived Holl and Bottière assisted the other men. By the first week of December Holl had finished the work he had been sent to do, with other odds and ends, and was asked by Ball, who had again come to see how the work was progressing, if he would like to return to England, to which he assented, and a date was fixed for his departure. When he packed up his tool chest, and was ready to go, a label with Maple's name and address, and underneath his own, was affixed to the chest to represent that he was one of Maple's workmen. He thinks the label must have been stuck on the chest by Ball's instructions when he (Holl) was not at work. Before leaving the Baron gave Holl 40 francs and Bottière 50, and hoped to see them again shortly, *i.e.*, when he moved his quarters, which he expected to do, and wanted his other place furnished and decorated. Maple, however, did not get this further contract, as a French firm obtained the work. Holl was paid and treated very well whilst there. Baron Rothschild made the remark one day that he expected to see all English workmen, instead of only one, who was Holl.

2190. I do not know what you allege; do you allege that Hole got in to Baron Rothschild's house under a misrepresentation that he was employed by Maple?

I maintain that a misrepresentation in this case was made by Maple.

2191. Hughes

2191. Hughes sent a particular man, Holl, into Baron Rothschild's château in France; do I understand that that is so?
Maple employed Hughes.

2192. Will you answer my question; did or did not Holl go under Hughes' order into Baron Rothschild's château?
He went.

2193. Then Hughes sent a workman of the name of Holl into Baron Rothschild's château; do I understand that to be so?
No, because Hughes had no connection with the Baron; his connection was with Maple; Maple was the middleman between Baron Rothschild and Hughes.

2194. Hughes, according to you, was the middleman between Maple and Baron Rothschild?
Baron Rothschild ordered certain furniture of Maple; Maple does not supply it himself, but gets it from a man named Hughes, and Hughes sends Holl to the château in France, Baron Rothschild thinking that he is Maple's man, while all the time he is not Maple's man.

2195. Baron Rothschild contracts with Maple to furnish a particular room, is that so?
Yes.

2196. Then Maple sub-lets, ad does something or other with a man named Hughes, in pursuance of which contract Hughes goes, by Maple's authority, to Baron Rothschild's château?
Holl goes.

2197. Holl goes through Hughes, who derives his authority from Maple?
That is precisely so.

2198. Then it is simply a sub-contract; there is Maple at the top of the scale, Hughes comes next, and then Holl, the workman?
Yes, that is all I allege. But then my allegation is that Baron Rothschild was ignorant of this sub-contracting.

2199. Of course he was; why should he know about the sub-contracting?
It is entirely a question of opinion. If you have a Foreign Trade Mark Act by which goods have to be what they are represented to be, it seems to come under precisely the same category.

2200. Earl of *Onslow.*] It was not the goods that were misrepresented; it was the man?
It was the man. That is my allegation, that there is a system in the trade which acts very hardly upon the workmen, of the big men selling goods they have no connection with.

2201. Lord *Thring.*] You admit, do you not, that Hughes was employed by Maple?
I do.

2202. And that Holl was employed by Hughes?
I do.

2203. And that Holl was the man who went to the château?
I do. Just as in the boot trade you have materials and manufacture guaranteed by people who know nothing whatever of the manufacture, and there is a dividing line, on the other side of which they are absolutely ignorant, so you have in the cabinet trade in the same way. Now, there is a witness who will be called before your Lordships, a man named Tisshaw, who lives at 168, Columbia-road, East. I found him in a miserable house of two rooms, the bottom room of which is used as the workshop, also the living room, in which his own wife did mangling when she could obtain any to do. This room was certainly not more than 9 feet 6 by 10 feet, and 8 feet high; it has one window, the door leading directly into the street. The old man had just completed a common deal Pembroke table, just like one of these (*pointing to*

to a table), such as will be bought by the working classes, which, with the two flaps, would measure 4 feet by 3 feet 6, and the flaps have clamps screwed across each end to keep them straight; it also had a drawer. Such a table, with ordinary care would last a working man a life time, and the poor man was then preparing, though it was raining heavily, to take it out to a broker's shop and endeavour to sell it. He said that three or four years ago he used to get 7 *s.* 6 *d.* for a similar table, and now he was glad to get 5 *s.*. or even 4 *s.* 6 *d.*, and often had to take it to Camden Town, and even as far as Edmonton, before he could find a purchaser, carrying it on his back the whole of the way, being too poor to hire a barrow. The material cost him 3 *s.* 6 *d.*, and he obtains as his remuneration for about eight hours of time 1 *s.* 6 *d.* He attributes this state of things to many foreigners being in the trade, German for the most part; and he adduces the case of box-making, where formerly 27 *s.* 6 *d.* was paid for sets of boxes, and where the price has now fallen to 12 *s.* and even 10 *s.* 6 *d.* He says that it is only eight years since this great fall has taken place; which again marks the date of the beginning of the immigration of these paupers; and the whole of the evidence seems to concentrate round that year 1880. As there are many other witnesses, I do not think it is worth while to read at any length the very large number of cases which I have collected here, and which go to show what is the connection of the cabinet trade with sweating. But I may, perhaps, be allowed just to say in conclusion, that the mere sitting of your Lordships' Committee has, to my knowledge, within the last few days, caused a great many great houses to look into their affairs and to set them in order. I know of one foreman in one of the largest tailoring houses in London being dismissed within the last two days because it was found that he was giving out the coats, for which six and seven guineas are paid by customers, to these poor people who were being sweated, and that he was getting the difference. I know another case of a foreman in a very large shop being dismissed for doing the same thing; that was in the cabinet trade. So that the effect that this Committee is producing is already very marked.

2204. *Chairman.*] I suppose you mean that you know that the foreman has been dismissed, and you assume that he has been dismissed on account of the reasons you have mentioned?

No, I do not assume that; I have it on the very best possible evidence.

2205. That these foremen have been dismissed on account of sweating?

On account of sweating.

2206. Earl of *Onslow.*] I understood that the masters were not aware that the sweating went on?

They were not aware; they never looked into it, but they are now in the way of knowing; this Committee has attracted attention to it.

2207. Earl of *Derby.*] You have said, as I understand, that in many cases orders are given which pass through two or three or even four persons, each of whom makes a profit upon the order as it passes through his hands; is not that a system by which the masters themselves must be losers; is it not their interest to put an end to all these middlemen?

The competition between the masters is intense, but the diminution in the price can only come out of the labour.

2208. *Chairman.*] I want to asked you one or two questions, because I am not quite clear that I thoroughly understand your meaning. First, as to this château of Baron Edmund de Rothschild. I understood you to say that Messrs. Maple contracted for the furnishing and decoration of the house?

For the furnishing of a château or part of a château.

2209. And you further said that they employed Hughes, I think it was, to do part of the work?

Yes.

2210. Those are the facts, and your opinion about them is that something in the nature of a fraud was perpetrated upon the owner of the house by that system of sub-contracting; you think it was an improper thing?

I think

I think the thing as it happened was an improper thing. As your Lordship states it, you have only stated half the facts.

2211. Will you correct me; that is what I understood you to say?
Where the misrepresentation comes in seems to be here. When Mr. Ball, the manager of Maple's, visited the château to see how the work was going on, and heard from Mr. Peterson, who was regarded as the foreman, that the Baron had been told by Bottière that he and Holl were not assisting the other men, because they did not come from the same firm, he was very indignant, and told the men that they must consider themselves as all working for Maple, and had no business to tell Baron Rothschild they did not work for the same firm as some of the other men.

2212. Quite so; but the facts are that Messrs. Maple, having contracted to furnish this house or part of it, sub-let part of the work to somebody else?
At all events they did not do it themselves; that is all I committed myself to.

2213. But is it not inevitable that such must be the case?
Provided it is frankly avowed, I have no objection.

2214. If a man undertakes to furnish a house, to put in stoves and mantelpieces, and all the rest of it, is it not absolutely necessary that he should employ other people?
Certainly, provided no representation is made that he does it himself.

2215. But in one sense he does it himself: he is responsible for the whole work?
Yes, you may take it so.

2216. Lord *Thring*.] If the work had been badly done, could not Baron de Rothschild have recovered against Messrs. Maple?
Certainly.

2217. *Chairman*.] Is not it universally the case that if I, or anyone, go to Messrs. Maple, or any other similar house, to furnish a house for me, he would employ somebody else, one man to put in stoves, and another man to put in mantelpieces, and so on, but that the Maple, or whoever it might be, would make himself responsible for the character of the work?
Yes.

2218. Then you also mention that some of these great houses sell as their own goods goods which are not made by them. What I want to ask you is whether those goods are not made for them; they are not made on their own premises, but they are made for them by men working in other places, are they not?
Yes, that is so.

2219. They do not put any stamp upon them, or in any way guarantee that they are made upon their own premises?
They put the stamp of their own name on on occasions.

2220. They stamp as being their goods goods which are made for them?
That is the whole point. What do they stamp them as? They put their name upon them, by which I, as a purchaser, should understand that they had made them. I may be wrong, but that would be by impression.

2221. You mean that if you bought a chair or a table with Maple's stamp, you would understand by that that of necessity that table or chair was made in Maple's own workshop?
May I put a case? If I were buying a Chippendale table, and there was the Chippendale stamp upon it, I should not expect that it was a table of Jones' or anybody else, but one of Chippendale's. It seems to me that if you have "Maple" on the table, Maple should make it.

2222. And in his own workshop?
Well, in his own workshop, or a workshop that he hires.

2223. You do not mean to say that there is any infraction of the Fraudulent Trade Marks Act in what you have described?

I think it is fraudulent; because, if you buy a Chippendale table, and it is not made by Chippendale, but by somebody else, I take it that you would have a remedy against the seller.

2224. Lord *Thring.*] Suppose I buy a Chippendale table, do you mean to say that I imagine that a Mr. Chippendale, if there be such a man (I do not believe there is), made it himself.

He and his workmen; you would certainly pay an excessive price in consequence of the name.

2225. But if it comes under the description of what is ordinarily called Chippendale furniture you would not imagine that Mr. Chippendale made it himself?

Take the case of a violin, a Stradivarius; a false one would be worth nothing; a real one, with his name stamped upon it, would be worth hundreds of guineas; I maintain that a table with Maple's name on it, and made in the Curtain-road by some poor wretch who has had to hawk it at a reduced rate, is not Maple's table, and that it is a fraud to call it so.

2226. Does not that merely mean that it is made for Messrs. Maple, and that they have inspected it and approved of it, and is not that the case in every other trade in the world?

No, I do not take that view of it. A hundred and fifty years ago, if a man put his name upon a musical instrument, or a piece of furniture, it implied that he, or his men under him, had made it, that he did not buy it in; that he did not take it as boots and furniture are bought in now. Now we have completely altered that.

2227. *Chairman.*] We are not talking of 150 years ago, but of the present day. But take a fashionable gunmaker who sells a gun with his name upon it; that does not of necessity mean that every portion of that gun has been made absolutely on his own permises?

No; but you give a high price for that gun because the man's name is a guarantee that it is what it pretends to be.

2228. Is not that exactly the case here?

No, certainly not.

2229. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] You do not consider it Maple's work if it is bought out of the street?

If he does not know where it is made I do not consider it is his work.

2230. Lord *Clinton.*] Do you allege that Messrs. Maple go into any street and pick up cheap furniture in the street, take it home, and polish it up and sell it as their own?

No; I say that they buy in furniture.

2231. Which is not so good as their own make would be, and which a purchaser, sooner or later, would find out not to be so good?

I do not say that their own make is good or bad; it might be better than their own.

2232. *Chairman.*] Would it be possible for a house like Maple's, for instance, to do all their work on their own premises?

I do not see the necessity for a house like Maple's.

2233. You complain that they do not do their work on their own premises. I want to ask you whether, from your knowledge of the trade, you think it would be possible for any firm of that kind to do all the work on their own premises?

No; I do not think, under a healthy condition of the trade, such a house would be possible.

2234. I want to know whether, assuming that such houses exist, as they do, it

it is possible for them to fulfil all their orders by doing all the work on their own premises?

No, I do not think they can; I think they must sweat to exist as they are; they purport to manufacture, but they do not.

2235. Lord *Rothschild.*] You would not attempt to hinder it by legislation?

No; but by purchasers having a little more technical knowledge of what they are buying.

2236. Earl of *Onslow.*] Has not the result of the establishment of such cheap furniture shops as Messrs. Maples, and others of that character, been very largely to cheapen the price to the consumer?

I think that much-favoured person has received some advantages in the point of low price; whether in cheapness or not is another question.

2237. *Chairman.*] about this discount which you say is taken off on cashing a cheque; I understand that you have no knowledge of that yourself?

No; but witnesses will be called who have stated it to me, and whom I believe.

2238. When you speak about the recognised wages of the trade, what do you mean?

The rate fixed by the unions and the masters. There is a statement which has existed from 1811, and which has been twice revised since then, and which, I think, we shall be able to put in, which will show you what those wages are. At present it is 9*d.* an hour. The Curtain-road rates I have only taken at 6*d.*, and from those rates the losses have to be deducted.

2239. You spoke just now about the greeners, a great number of them setting up for themselves?

I did not say a great number set up for themselves in the cabinet trade; I adduced certain instances of their doing so.

2240. Have you any idea what amount of capital is required to set up?

A very small amount indeed, as they can obtain timber on credit. A few tools are wanted, and of course a shed or room. I have visited a good many of them myself, and the apparatus was of the scantiest description.

2241. About how much?

I should think 5 *l.* to 10 *l.*, with such credit as they could get.

2242. A certain number of these pauper immigrants are enabled in a short time to save up 5 *l.* or 10 *l.* to start themselves?

A certain number, or rather an uncertain number.

2243. Some of them do?

Some of them do.

2244. About that question of pauperism, I would like clearly to understand what you wish the Committee to understand as your opinion about it. I understood you to say that very few of these foreign immigrants came upon the rates?

Hardly any.

2245. But that a considerable number of them were voluntarily assisted or supported by charity. I want to know, in the first place, whether, in your opinion, if they were not so assisted by charity, they would be able to compete with English labour?

I do not think they would.

2246. Then I understood you also to say that, competing as they do with English labour, they displace a considerable amount of English labour, which does come upon the rates?

I believe so.

2247. Can you give the Committee your reason for thinking so?

I have not the evidence of that with me, because that comes under the pauper foreigners' question; but I am now engaged in tracing a direct link between the

the greeners, specific cases of greeners who have come over, and specific English men, particular English men and English women, and English girls, who have been displaced in consequence of the arrival of these people.

2248. That evidence you propose to give later?
I hope to be ready with it this day week for another Committee. Of course it is a difficult thing to establish in a large number of cases.

2249. It does exist, you say?
That is my contention and most sincere belief. The effect of charity on these greeners is very different to the effect of charity on the ordinary Englishman. Charity pauperises the average low-class Englishman; but these Jews who come over are not pauperised by this charity; they use it as a ladder till they get to a better position; they use it wisely, and are uninjured by the temporary assistance they have; at least, that is my belief.

2250. These great shops, you say, send out plans of the furniture, and so on, they want to the trade workshops, and the goods are then made according to the plan, I presume, and sent back to the great shop; is that so?
Yes, sent home to the great shop.

2251. Where they are inspected and approved of, and sold as the work of the great shop?
Yes.

2252. And that you object to?
Yes, very strongly.

2253. Besides that, you mentioned that a number of these small working men make furniture and hawk it about the streets?
Yes.

2254. That is quite a different branch of the trade again?
A lower branch.

2255. And it is in that lowest branch you consider that most of the evils lie; they are mostly confined to that?
The evils of the foreign labour are restricted to the lowest branches; but I think the sweating, as represented by the discounts and by the system of sub-contracting, is not restricted to the lowest branches.

2256. You contend that these paupers do not get proper remuneration for their labour?
Advantage is taken of their necessities; and whenever that is an element in a bargain the freedom is only on one side.

2257. Now, will you tell the Committee why you select the year 1880 as the year when the sweating system evils became so intensified?
Because I cannot discover any evidence of its existence, in the particular form that we have been going into, before 1880, and I cannot discover any considerable immigration before that year. But every individual witness, whether he is educated or uneducated, will tell your Lordships that things have become bad since 1880; and, to my mind, that points to a specific cause which arose in 1880. On looking round upon the history of that year, I can see nothing that might have affected the economy of these trades except the immigration.

2258. Lord *Rothschild.*] Would you not say that the agricultural depression had something to do with it?
I said that I did not think that pauper immigration was the only cause, but that it was a contributory cause.

2259. *Chairman.*] You will admit that the sweating system existed long before 1880?
Forty years ago.

2260. And that this minute sub-division of labour has existed for a long time?

It

It has existed for a long time, but not to any such extent as lately.

2261. You consider that both sub-division of labour and the evils of the sweating system have become intensified of late years, especially since 1880?
Especially since 1880.

2262. And noticing at the same time that the immigration of foreign paupers has increased since 1880, you attribute it, to some extent, to that as the cause?
Yes.

2263. Lord *Thring.*] Certainly; 35 years ago the custom in the cabinet trade of sub-dividing labour, so that one man made only the legs and another man made the bulk of the table, existed precisely as it does now?
I believe it did; but what you will not find 35 years ago is the existence of boy labour.

2264. *Chairman.*] You spoke of boys being indentured; can you tell the Committee what the terms of their indentures are?
I can put in an indenture; I have got one; the terms are that no premium is paid, and they receive 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a week for the first year and so on, as I stated earlier in my evidence.

2265. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] Are you able to show from statistics, independently of this inquiry, that there was a great increase of immigration suddenly in 1880?
Quite apart, wholly irrelevant to it; I have come to this inquiry through those statistics, not *vice versâ*?

2266. *Chairman.*] You will be able to put in evidence of that?
I shall be able to do so.

2267. With regard to these cheap goods that are hawked about, is not that a great advantage to the working people?
It is a great advantage to those consumers; but you have got to think of the producer as well.

2268. Have you any idea by how much the class of goods like that table has become cheaper since 1880?
I think that manuscript book which I handed in will show you. Yes, we shall be able to tell that.

2269. What I want to get at is whether the articles have been much cheapened?
They have been much cheapened. I adduced the case of the boxes, which have fallen from 27 *s.* 6 *d.* to 12 *s.* and 10 *s.* 6 *d.* I think I can give you the figures for this very table. Three or four years ago the worker used to get 7 *s.* 6 *d.* for a similar table; now he is glad to get 5 *s.* or 4 *s.* 6 *d.*

2270. That is the selling price?
That is the selling price of the worker to the shop.

2271. But what is the difference in the price at which the shop sells to the customer?
That one of the expert witnesses coming will be able to say; I cannot. This table is usually sold by the furniture broker for from 8 *s.* 6 *d.* to 6 *s.*

2272. Earl of *Derby.*] You tell us that these immigrants very seldom come on the rates, and that, though they receive charity, they are not pauperised by it?
Yes.

2273. And I suppose we may take it from the evidence you have given that they are eminently and even exceptionally industrious; is not that so?
That is so.

2274. Is there anything to object to on the score of their morals?
No, they are exceptionally moral, and they are good parents.

 2275. With

2275. With reference to their not contributing to taxation, of which we heard something, I presume that they are liable to all burdens to which an Englishman is subject, while they live in England?

No; because they, many of them, do not naturalise, and therefore not liable to serve in the Army or Navy, or police, or to serve on juries, or in any other respect that I know.

2276. Lord *Thring.*] An Englishman is not liable to serve in the Army or Navy?

Is he not liable to be sworn as a special constable?

2277. Earl of *Derby.*] Surely you are aware that there is no compulsory service in the Army or Navy of this country?

But it is not possible for them to discharge the duties of citizenship. They have all the advantages of defence and citizenship, without any of its burdens.

2278. The sole compulsory burden which they do not bear being that of serving on juries?

I believe there is an Act by which anybody may be forced to be sworn in as a special constable.

2279. But does that make a serious difference between their situation and that of other people, non-liability to be called upon to serve as special constables?

I think that is a very large symbol; I think it is a symbol of a very large thing; that England is inhabited by the English, and that if the English are to be displaced by people who do not bear the burdens of the country, who have no strong sense of nationality, or affection for their country, while, economically, it may be very profitable to the consumer, it is absolute destruction to the national life. And that process is going on.

2280. Do you think there ever has been a time in the history of England, when our population has not been increased by emigrants and refugees from one part or another of the Continent?

If your Lordship will contrast the immigration of the Hugenots after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, when they brought new trade, capital, skill, and good citizenship, with the characteristics of the immigrants who are now coming in, who have no one single qualification when they arrive but physical fitness, I maintain that there is no comparison to be made between the immigrants from the Low Countries after Alva's persecutions, and after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and the people who are now coming in in hundreds.

2281. But I thought you said just now that in point of industry, independence, and morals, they are far above the average?

There is no use in a man being industrious if he has not anything to do, and does not know any trade, like those two "greeners" you saw here. A man may have the finest moral qualities, and yet be in the way.

2282. Do not they learn a trade?

Only by pushing somebody else out.

2283. You do not think that there is any advantage to the community in acquiring the services of a class of men, such as you describe, industrious, independent, and moral?

I do not think the advantage is commensurate with the immense evil which it has caused.

2284. Now, as to their displacing native labour, is there not a very large natural increase of population at the East End?

Enormous. The fecundity of the East End may be roughly stated to be double per family that of Grosvenor-square.

2285. So I suppose. Then do you believe that the number of those who come in bears any appreciable proportion to the number added to the population by the process of natural increase?

I believe the numerical ratio is comparatively trifling; but it seems to me, after careful thought on the subject, that regarding the question simply as a matter

matter of numbers is fallacious. The number of dynamiters who came into this country three or four years ago was small; but the House of Commons did not ask, "What are the numbers of dynamiters coming in?" They asked, "What are the effects they produce?" And so I submit that the effects which these immigrants produce is the question we should consider; not how many they are.

2286. Then you think that we should be justified in excluding them on the express ground that they work harder and cheaper than our own people?

No; I should exclude them on the express ground that their addition lends no strength or wealth to the country; that America with her millions of free acres has for six years past excluded them; and that we, with no millions of free acres, but 300,000 naked, hungry babies coming into the world every year, are virtually the dust-heap of Europe; and that what is bad for America is bad for England.

2287. America excludes, we understand, those who are likely to become paupers, or do not seem to be in a position to maintain themselves; but you do not say that that is the case with these persons?

I only wish to exclude those whom America excludes. I divided the greeners into three classes: into the younger men, the middle-aged men, who have passed the Army, and the old men over 50. I wish to exclude the men that America would exclude.

2288. Lord *Rothschild.*] The older men?

Mostly those. I would not take a man who was diseased or a lunatic.

2289 Earl of *Onslow.*] I daresay you know that your views as to excluding the pauper immigrants are shared to a great extent by the committee of the Whitechapel Union?

I am; I have been in communication with them.

2290. And they point out in their report that the majority of those who land in this country would not be excluded under the American law?

That I am aware of.

2291. I want to ask you a question as to the system in the cabinet-making trade; I do not understand you to say that there is any great grievance in the cabinet-making trade of an abuse of the contract system; but that the abuse you have in your mind is rather the inability of the cabinet-makers to obtain a sale for their goods after they have made them?

I do not think there is any sort of grievance in the cabinet trade. I only discover the germs of the sweating system in it; there is no widespread discontent; and, except in isolated houses, there is not a very widespread cause of evil.

2292. You said that the earnings of a man who made, I forget whether it was one of those tables or something else, would be 6 *s.* a day; that he would be able to make two articles at 3 *s.* a day each?

Yes, I did; it was a Pembroke table.

2293. Would you consider that a starvation rate of wage?

No, I should not.

2294. Then you said, I think, that in the cabinet-making trade a large number of women and girls were employed, but that the Factory Inspector never visited the workshops?

I did not say a large number of girls and women; I said that in the Bethnal Green departments of the cabinet trade women and girls were employed in these sheds, and that the visits of the Factory Inspector did not take place. Of course all that points to the registration of workshops.

2295. Do you know whether those places are visited by the sanitary inspector of the local authority?

Some are; some are not.

2296. Do you know whether the inspector of the local authority is aware that the duties of the Factory Inspector are confined to those places that we have had already mentioned in evidence, namely, where young people are employed?

I am unacquainted with the knowledge of the sanitary inspector as to his colleague.

2297. You have never heard a statement on the part of the sanitary inspector that he had nothing to do with it; that it came under the Factory Inspector?

I have not; I have heard of collisions between them.

2298. Lord *Clinton.*] As to these 207 immigrants who arrived within a short time on Sunday night, do you know anything more about them than that they arrived?

I can give the names, addresses, and destinations, and probable employment of about 50 of them?

2299. And what is that?

I have not the papers with me, as it is a different subject.

2300. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] You laid stress on the absence of interest in the national welfare on the part of those immigrants rather than on any actual immunities which they possess?

Yes; the second generation becomes English, but they—— No.

2301. I suppose, even on the part of some of our own people, there is not a very vivid sense of patriotism and interest in the national welfare?

I think on great occasions it is possible to touch it and to rouse it; but, at all events, there is in them something which there is not in the others; they are our own flesh and blood; there is race, language, and colour.

2302. Generally speaking, your experience leads you to think that their children are fused with the native population?

They do not intermarry with Christians, as a rule; more so perhaps than hitherto.

2303. They adopt English traditions and customs?

It is a delicate subject, but I do not think they become thoroughly English.

2304. Lord *Sandhurst.*] You said that certain firms, Holland, Gillow, and one or two others, formerly engaged a large number of men, and are now very much depressed; you said that Mr. Holland engaged 70 or 80 and now six, and Gillows 70 to 80 and now about 18; is that because the trade has fallen off, or because they have given their work out?

Not because they have given out, but because of the spread of the sub-contracting system.

2305. About what age are these boy apprentices?

About 14.

2306. They are apprentices for about five years?

About that.

2307. And therefore at 19 they generally are in the position of not being able to follow any particular trade?

Only a bit of it.

2308. Lord *Monkswell.*] How do you account for the fact that in the upholstery matters are worse than they are in the cabinet-making; did you say that?

I did not say that.

2309. As bad?

I did not express an opinion.

2310. Is it bad in the upholstery trade?

I think it is bad.

2311. And yet there is no machinery and no foreign labour in that trade?

No.

2312. And

2312. And, therefore, two of the items you object to do not come in there?
They do not; but there is a substitution for foreign labour of the system of boy labour.

2313. *Chairman.*] Can you tell the Committee at all what it is that determines the fate of these greeners; I suppose they are all much about the same class?
Very much the same class.

2314. Some of them become bootmakers, some tailors, and some cabinet-makers; have you any idea what it is that determines which a man shall become?
The line of least resistance.

2315. They do not come over here with any premeditated plan you think?
No; it is generally in consequence of a friend writing to them, and if that friend happens to be in the boot-making trade, he will take the greener and introduce him to some knifer, or, if he is in the tailoring trade, to some tailor.

2316. Earl of *Onslow.*] Do you think that the immigration into London of agricultural labourers out of work has contributed in a large degree to depress the price of wages?
Are you speaking of wages all over London, or in any particular branch, or of unskilled labour?

2317. Unskilled labour in the East End of London?
After the experience I had two years ago in wandering about one night a week for some months, when I picked up these 5,700 people, I should say there was undoubtedly then an immigration of agricultural labourers.

2318. Where from?
Principally from the Home Counties; but I believe that that immigration has almost entirely stopped; I believe there is very little immigration now; so that although the rate of wages for unskilled labour was affected by that cause up to two years ago, I do not believe it is now.

2319. What were the agricultural labourers who came in from the Home Counties; were they men who had been habitually agricultural labourers, or men who had merely moved down for hop-picking and temporary agricultural labour?
They were for the most part men who had been agricultural labourers. Hop-pickers are exclusively East-Enders.

2320. Can you say what proportion of the number you mentioned just now were agricultural labourers?
About one-fifth, about 20 per cent. They are always distinguishable by their dress and accent and demeanour. A man sinks into the pot-hat of Democracy, and the seedy dirty black coat in three months; and you can always tell a man who has worked as an agricultural labourer by his dress.

2321. When they did get employment, what was it?
Fighting for work like dogs at the dock gates.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

HENRY MILLER is called in, and having been sworn; is Examined, as follows:

2322. *Chairman.*] WHAT is your trade?
I am a journeyman cabinet-maker now; previous to the year 1880 I was a journeyman; I began business in the year 1880 as a master cabinet-maker; I started in the West End of London in a small way with about three men on it. The first goods that I manufactured I took to Maple's. I was asked how many I could make in a week; I told them about one suite.

2323. What kind of goods were these?
A 6-foot bedroom suite (6-foot wardrobe). He told me that he required 50, and

that I had better put on a lot of men. I told him that I had not the capital to do so, as money would be required for wages on Saturday, also for material. He told me that if I wanted any money I could have it. I took larger premises and put on about 20 men. He gave me an order amounting to about 450 *l.* altogether. I took it in at the rate of 120 *l.* a week. I established a certain amount of credit in the market. After serving with him for about two years, I took another large order, and after the order was completed he told me to keep it, as he did not want it. I drew his attention to the fact that I had bought timber, which otherwise I should not have bought, only to complete his order; also to the number of men that I had got on, and they would require wages to-morrow (this being on a Friday). He told me to bring my invoice. He had always been in the habit of taking 5 per cent. off the cash. I did not see my invoice after he took it. Instead of getting my cheque on Friday night, I was kept waiting till the last minute on Saturday afternoon; I went over several times on the Saturday morning for the cheque, and he told me I should have it, but he should have an extra bit off.

2324. When you say "he" told you, who told you?

One of the partners of the firm; he has unlimited power; the heads of the firm have nothing to do with it; it all has to be done through this one man. He told me if I did not like it I had better sell the goods elsewhere. I asked where I could take 300 *l.* worth of goods and sell them in five minutes to meet the liabilities that I had incurred through him? He told me that was nothing whatever to do with him, and walked away. He asked me if I would have it in cash, or whether I would have it in a cheque, as he had no time to stop. I told him the cheque being big I should require the cash. When I got the cash I found instead of 5 per cent. off it was 20, which I considered was 15 per cent. for cashing the cheque. I made a complaint in the counting-house, and they said it was nothing to do with them; they only had to make out the amount according to the amount on the statement, and if I objected to it I had better go down stairs and see Mr. Regnart, that being the gentleman's name.

2325. What is he, a foreman?

A partner in the firm I am given to understand. Any complaint which you might have as regards any transactions which you had done with the firm would not be listened to by the head of the firm; it all has to be done through Mr. Regnart; it was no use going to the heads because they would not listen to you. On several occasions we, that served the firm with goods, were compelled to take a certain amount in material.

2326. A certain amount of what?

In the shape of timber, and glass, and tiles, and marbles, which marbles and tiles were invoiced to us at net price; on the timber and glass they allowed us 2½ off the invoiced price. We had to find the labour to make up the goods. When the goods were made up, they invariably took from 10 to 15 or 20 per cent. off the goods.

2327. Off the price you had contracted to make them for, do you mean?

Yes. The materials, for instance, were very often charged 10 per cent. or 15 per cent. more than we could get them for elsewhere; it was deducted off our account after the heavy discount was taken off; so that they got their own goods back and got a profit on their own material, allowing 12½ per cent, getting it back manufactured, and taking 15 per cent. off, and very often 20 to 25. On one occasion he asked me what I could do a certain amount of furniture for. The order amounted to about 320 *l.* I gave him an estimate in for it, and he told me that he should want it considerably less; I told him that the labour was cut as fine as it possibly could be. He said, "All nonsense; you can get it from the men; you may squeeze it out of them, and those that you cannot squeeze you may shunt; it is just as easy to get men, I find, as it is herrings from Billingsgate." I took this order, and I endeavoured to make a reduction on my wages, which I was compelled to do, and which I accomplished to a certain extent; and notwithstanding that, we got the work completed at the reduced rate that he wished, when I wanted to deliver it on the Tuesday night to insure getting my wages early on Friday, so as not to have to wait about on Saturday for

for payment; I could not get the goods delivered before late on Saturday, because he would not have them in; and after making a certain amount of reduction, he concluded by taking off 20 per cent., after getting the order completed for the original price he agreed to pay me. I went and endeavoured to see Mr. Maple, but I could not get to do so. I was afterwards told it would be no use, as I should have to see Mr. Regnart and nothing else could be done without him. I had to take these premises, and I had to pay a heavy rental for that; premises worth about 40 *l.* a year I had to pay 95 *l.* for.

2328. Where are your premises?
They were in Southampton Buildings, Euston-street, Euston-road.

2329. Lord *Rothschild.*] You were charged rent for the premises?
The rent was deducted out of the cheque; Mr. Regnart used to claim the premises as his private property, but the rent was always deducted out of the account in the counting house by Maple. I endeavoured to open an account in several other West End houses, but it is a rule amongst a lot of them, and is well known to Maples, that once you get into the power of Maples and serve them with goods, it is impossible to open an account with other houses. I had to discharge a certain number of men, and one or two happened to get a job at Maple's as fixers; as soon as it was found out after my dispute with Maple's that they had been working with me——

2330. *Chairman.*] What are fixers; what is their work?
Screwing up blinds, or jobbing men. When it was found that these men had been employed by me, they were ordered to be discharged, or anyone that had been employed by me was not allowed to have a job, on account of the dispute which I have told you of with the firm of Maple's. It is a well known fact that there were at that time about six small masters employing altogether about 140 to 150 men; they have all shared the same fate as I have in serving this identical firm. Then they get you to establish a certain amount of credit in the market, and when you have got up to your limits they begin to put the screw on, not only getting the benefit of the capital that you started with, but they get the benefit of your labour, and leave you with nothing to meet the liabilities, and they generally conclude by recommending you to their solicitors to call a meeting of the creditors.

2331. Is that all you have to say?
That is about all.

2332. Are you still in the same business now?
I am in the same business; I am working at journeyman's work.

2333. You told us, as I understand you, that you once showed Messrs. Maple a sample of the work you could do?
Yes.

2334. And that their representative then told you that he wanted a large quantity, and that you had better put on a number of hands, and offered to supply you with work?
Yes, he could help me with some money, he said.

2335. Did he?
Yes, on one occasion 100 *l.*, to be paid back 5 *l.* a week, deducted out of the account. He deducted 5 *l.*, and we had to allow him 2½ per cent. for that. He deducted out of the account 5 *l.* for two weeks, and on the third week he deducted the whole.

2336. Lord *Thring.*] Just state specifically the sum that you paid. Do you say you paid 5 *l.* a week?
Yes.

2337. For two weeks?
Yes, for two weeks; they deducted it out of the account.

2338. That is 10 *l.*?
Yes.

2339. He deducted 10 *l.* out of the account, you say?
Yes.

2340. Then what do you say happened on that?
On the third week, instead of taking in the usual way, as agreed, 5 *l.*, he took off the 92 *l.* 10*s.*

2341. On the third week how much did he deduct?
£92 10*s.*

2342. *Chairman.*] You had borrowed 100 *l.*?
Yes.

2343. For how long?
To pay back at 5 *l.* a week, to be deducted out of the accounts.

2344. Instead of that he made you pay it all in the third week?
He stopped it in the third week, including the 2 *l.* 10 *s.* for interest.

2345. Earl of *Onslow.*] You paid him back finally 102 *l.* 10 *s.* instead of 100 *l.*
Yes.

2346. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] The interest had not amounted to 2 *l.* 10 *s.* by that time?
No.

2347. *Chairman.*] How did you get your orders afterwards from Messrs. Maple?
We used to have them on a kind of printed form; the orders written out in pencil; and very often he would give the orders verbally.

2348. Do you mean you would settle the price with him verbally?
For the general run of goods; if I made a suite for 20 *l.* or 30 *l.* and he wanted it repeated, he would know the price.

2349. You had got no regular contract; no forms?
We had forms in the shape of orders, but they would not bind themselves to them; you could draw their attention to the fact that the printed order was the price to be given for the goods, but they would ignore it.

2350. Could you produce any such order?
I do not know whether I could find some; I might.

2351. I understood you to say that you have contracted to execute certain works for a certain price, and afterwards you have not got the price?
Yes.

2352. Had you no contract or engagement on the part of the firm to pay you?
No, not any. The orders they would give you daily. You would have to wait in the office to see what orders there were for you every morning.

2353. Then you had no written form of contract?
No, no agreement whatever; we never do have.

2354. When you borrowed this money, did you have no bill for it?
No.

2355. Lord *Thring.*] Was it done verbally?
Yes.

2356. He said to you, "You shall pay 5 *l.* every week," in so many words?
Yes. I might tell you the origin of the 100 *l.* It was this: There was some wood, in the shape of walnut, for sale in the docks; he asked me to go and look at it and buy it; I told him I could not; he said "Never mind about the bill; I will meet it when it is due." I had told him I should have a bill due on that date; he said "I will lend you 100 *l.* and charge you 2½ per cent., and pay me back 5 *l.* a week;" so that the payment was to extend over 20 weeks.

2357. What did you say when you were required in the third week to pay the whole; did you not complain?

When

When you went to complain you were simply laughed at; you could get no explanation.

2358. What reason did he allege?
He would give no reason.

2359. Was this Mr. Regnart?
Yes, if you complained in the counting-house they would say it was not their doing; and if you were sent down to Mr. Regnart, he would keep you two or three hours waiting, and so in nine cases out of ten you had to submit.

2360. *Chairman.*] Is it the custom in your trade for a man to entrust you with work for 300 *l.* or 400 *l.* without any written undertaking?
Yes, very often.

2361. Lord *Thring.*] And for a man to borrow money in the same way?
I do not know. Plenty of firms advance without acknowledgment.

2362. *Chairman.*] They pay by cheque?
Yes, except when they cash it in the counting office, with the extra discount.

2363. And you complain that you are not paid till late on Saturday?
Till two o'clock very often.

2364. And then you could not cash it?
I could not cash it; and even if I had had it early in the morning I could not cash it; they are always crossed cheques.

2365. Who are the cheques signed by?
Sometimes by Mr. Blundell Maple, and sometimes by Mr. Maple, senior.

2366. You get paid in cheques on Saturday afternoon, and then you say you are charged so much per cent. for getting it cashed by the firm?
That is done beforehand, before you get the cheque; he makes himself perfectly aware of the position you are in before he gives you the cheque. If you tell him you must have the cash, you only find an extra 5 per cent. taken off; the cheque is not given, but it is simply drawn for the purpose of endorsing it.

2367. On one occasion you said that he said he must have a little more off, and that he had taken as much off as 20 per cent.
Yes, he has.

2368. Could you not get one of Maple's cheques cashed on Saturday afternoon?
I could when they have been for a small amount. For instance, I have had cheques for 150 *l*, or 200 *l*, ; it was impossible for me to get a big cheque like that cashed in a public-house.

2369. A small one you could get cashed?
I have got cheques cashed for 80 *l.*, when I have had to take a certain amount in paper, in notes, and I have had a certain amount of drink, and then I have had to go back and get three men together and give them a 5 *l.* note, as I did not care to enter another public-house, and get them to enter it, and cash the cheques themselves, and then one pays the others out of it.

2370. What you contend is that your payments, which are due on Friday, or before that, are purposely kept back till Saturday, in order that your necessities may enable this percentage to be taken off in cashing?
Yes, it is the general practice of that firm to do so.

2371. Have you ever worked for any other firms?
Yes.

2372. Was it the practice with them also?
No, I never experienced it before.

2373. How were you paid by the other firms?
In cheques.

2374. On Friday?
I have got the cheques on the same day I sent the goods in without any waiting,

waiting, and other days I have had the cheques at the usual pay time; they have had the usual pay time at 12 o'clock on Saturday, and I have got my money without any trouble or extra discount.

2375. You said that Messrs. Maple supplied their own materials for you to work with?
They have of late years.

2376. With the exception of glass?
No, glass and all, everything.

2377. And you think that you could get as good materials cheaper yourself?
Yes, goods that they invoiced to me at 8 *d.* a foot, for instance, I could have gone and bought at 6 *d.*

2378. Timber?
Yes, timber.

2379. You are prepared to say that you could get as good material cheaper?
Yes.

2380. You are compelled to take it from Maple's?
Yes, we are compelled; the account is taken out every Saturday, what they call the contra account.

2381. Is that the habit of other firms you have worked for?
No.

2382. Do not you think it may be done to ensure that it is proper material?
No, because some of the material was very inferior. The locks, for instance, that we have had to put on them were locks we could have bought at 2½ *d.* each, 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a dozen.

2383. Earl of *Onslow.*] At any rate, Messrs. Maple were satisfied?
It was their own goods; they could not find any fault with it.

2384. *Chairman.*] And how about these premises that you went into; who do you say the landlord is?
Mr. Regnart.

2385. What did you go into the premises for?
On account of their being big, for the purpose of enabling me to put more men on.

2386. I mean, did you pick them out for yourself?
No.

2387. He induced you to take them?
He induced me to take them.

2388. How?
He promised me any amount of work, and I, being a young beginner at that time, if I worked and studied the firm, in a few years, he said, I should be in the possession of 1,000 *l.*, or in a very short time, and he would keep me going with orders, and give me a good price. After he had got me in there he had me entirely in his power.

2389. Were you apprenticed to this trade as a boy?
Yes, for seven years.

2390. What did you do after that?
I went journey working.

2391. How long were you working as a journeyman?
I suppose about 10 or 15 years.

2392. Then you set up for yourself in a small way, employing three men under you?
Four men altogether.

2393. What work did you do yourself?
I used to go out and buy the material; then I used to get back and assist, by

by making the small work; work that would not take very long to make, on account of my having to go in and out; and the others I kept at the table to make the work that took the longer time.

2394. What kind of work did you make?
I made the top parts of the tables at times, because it did not take so long.

2395. What kind of work, I mean, was made in your workshop?
Suites from 12 *l.* up to 45 *l.* and 60 *l.*

2396. Drawing-room furniture?
Not drawing-room; sideboards and bedroom suites.

2397. And how long after you set up for yourself was it before you took a specimen of your work to Maples?
About a month.

2398. And you told us that having once worked for Messrs. Maple, it was impossible for you to get work from any other large firm?
It was very difficult; I had already made an opening in one or two firms before ever I had taken anything to Maples; and when they found, as they called it, that I was under the power of Maples, they refused, or did not care to have anything to do with me.

2399. Did they tell you why?
No.

2400. Did they tell you that that was the reason why they refused employment?
No, they did not say that; they said, "You are under the power of Maples, I suppose, and it is not worth while giving any orders."

2401. You mean to say that they gave, as the reason for not giving orders, that you were what they called under the power of Maples?
Yes, that is how we take it.

2402. And what are you doing now?
Working journey work.

2403. Since when?
For these last two years.

2404. You were obliged to give up the other?
Yes, I gave it up.

2405. The Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] Were you made a bankrupt?
No.

2406. How did you avoid that?
I paid a composition.

2407. *Chairman.*] Who are you working for?
For a party in Old-street.

2408. You have never seen Mr. Maple himself on this subject?
No, it was no use going to him; it was only a waste of time to attempt to see him.

2409. How did you know that it was?
Of course he had been seen before; and he had come up one time when I was complaining about the price that Mr. Regnart wanted to give me for the article, and Mr. Maple was on the spot at the time, when he said, "Make him a reasonable offer," and walked away. Of course the meaning of that was that there was to be no advance.

2410. As a matter of fact Mr. Regnart was the man you had to deal with?
Yes.

2411. Do you know any other men who make for Maples?
Yes.

2412. Do you know whether the treatment which you describe with regard to your case is customary?
It is with Maple.

2413. They treat everybody alike?
Those that I knew that I was connected with during the time they served me this way, they served in the same manner.

2414. Lord *Rothschild.*] Do any of the other houses act in the same way?
No.

2415. Lord *Monkswell.*] Did you complain to Mr. Maple himself that he took 20 per cent. instead of 5 per cent. off when he paid the bill?
No.

2416. Why?
Because it was worthless to go to him.

2417. How is it if these practices go on that they can get workmen to work for them?
Unfortunately, there are so many in the market that produce the goods; as soon as one is down up springs another.

2418. I suppose you have talked with your friends about it?
Yes.

2419. Earl of *Onslow.*] But you told the Committee that you were offered by Messrs. Maple or their agents either cash or a cheque?
Yes.

2420. And when you took the cash did you receive it less 5 per cent?
Yes.

2421. What did you say to the person who paid it?
I said, "This is not right," and he said, "Here is your statement," and the statement was generally marked "20 off O.C.," and he would not enter into any argument with you; you had to go and see Mr. Regnart.

2422. Had you seen the statement made; had you agreed with it?
No.

2423. In what way was the statement altered?
The statement was 200 and odd pounds, or whatever the amount was; I would hand in the statement and he would take the statement, and you would not know as a rule what you were going to get till you went up for the cheque.

2424. Would that be entered upon your statement, "To amount due, 210 *l.* (say) less discount, so much"?
No, it would be marked what was to be taken off; and if you complained of the amount of the cheque when you were in the counting-house, the statement would be shown to you with what Mr. Regnart had taken off, and the man in the counting-house would say, he had nothing to do with it, and if you did not like the amount you must go and find Mr. Regnart.

2425. I understand that the statement showed the gross sum which was due to you, less 5 per cent., which had been deducted?
Twenty per cent.

2426. But you had made no agreement and no contract that you would supply the goods for a given sum?
Yes.

2427. In what way was there a contract?
Verbal agreement, because on some occasions he had paid that price in the beginning; he had paid the regular price for the goods, less 5 per cent off for cash; if they were goods for 20 *l.*, 25 *l.*, or 30 *l.*, he had paid it for a certain time, and repeated the orders for the same class and quality of goods.

2428. Is it an understood thing in your trade that cash means not a cheque or bill, but actual coin of the realm?
I always considered a cheque as good as cash if I got it in a reasonable time.

2429. When

2429. When did you go to be paid, always on Saturday?
The proper time for payment to us was on a Friday night, but they would invariably keep us, if they wanted to accomplish anything, till the last thing on Saturday.

2430. And then do you receive payment for your goods on no other day?
Yes, we have; perhaps if I have been very short in the week, I have gone and asked him to give me a cheque in the middle of the week, and then I have had to pay for that.

2431. I suppose when you accepted the contract for making these goods you were fully aware that you would have to take your material from Messrs. Maple's yard or store?
Yes, I was perfectly aware that I should have to take a certain quantity.

2432. And you knew the prices that Messrs. Maple charged for their goods?
Yes.

2433. And you took that into calculation before you accepted the contract?
Yes, I had no other choice; it was a matter of compulsion.

2434. Lord *Monkswell.*] Do I understand that you were shown the statement, and that the amount on the face of the statement was the amount you expected to obtain from Messrs. Maple?
Yes.

2435. But when the 20 per cent. was deducted, it was always put on the face of the statement "20 per cent. off," do I understand?
Yes, after the statement was delivered.

2436. There was no separate agreement each time you did work, but you did a certain amount of work once a week for several weeks, and you got the money you expected, and then one week you would do the same work and get less money?
Yes.

2437. But no separate agreement?
No, the same agreement always.

2438. *Chairman.*] You mentioned that sometimes you had to take payments partly in goods?
Yes.

2439. Did you know beforehand when that would be the case?
No, it was entirely at their option.

2440. Was it a frequent occurrence?
It is now at the present time.

2441. During the present year it has become more common?
Yes, with this particular firm, but not the others.

2442. You were asked whether Messrs. Maple were satisfied with some work, some locks; I think you said they were satisfied because it was their own material?
If they had made any complaint as to the inferior quality of the locks, you could have pointed out that they had supplied them themselves.

2443. Were the customers satisfied as far as you know?
As a rule, we often had to have them back.

2444. When you delivered goods at any private house did you appear there as representing Messrs. Maple's firm?
On one occasion I was sent to a lady's house and I had to represent that I had come from Messrs. Maple's, and this suite of mine, for which I had got a net sum of £25, had been retailed to this lady for 55 guineas.

2445. You found that out by an accident, I suppose?
Yes.

2446. You would not represent that as a particular hardship so long as you got your own agreements carried out fairly?

I did, because this particular thing was a particular price, and I thought it would have been no harm his paying me the price he had already agreed to give me when I took the order.

2447. With regard to putting off payment till Saturday, I think you answered the noble Chairman that you had an impression that it was in order to get a further deduction?

Yes, that is so.

2448. But even if you had no reason to suppose there was any special purpose of that kind, you would feel it a grievance that the money should be paid or cheques given at such times as rendered it difficult for you to get the cash from the bank?

If I could have done without the money on the Saturday, there is not the slightest doubt they would have given it me on the Friday; when they get to know that you might be able to get money one week without a cheque, you invariably get it on Friday, and it is only when you get to a big amount that you are not paid properly. They would often ask me, "What are your wages this week, and what have you to pay?" Perhaps I have a great amount of goods finished, and I shall only take a certain amount of this week's money to enable me to pay wages, and next week's production, and what was left over from this week, would be a pretty big amount; and that is the time when they would play on you.

2449. Could you not have made some arrangement with some parties with whom you were acquainted as to exchanging cheques rather than going to a public house?

I have on several occasions, but you could never know the exact time you would get your cheque. It was difficult for people in my position to find a friend who would cash a cheque for 150 *l.* or 200 *l.* at any time you wanted it.

2450. Was it often after two o'clock on Saturday?

Generally between one and two.

2451. Is that with the idea that you could get to a bank by two o'clock?

It would be no good; the cheques are printed crossed, and the bank would not pay you the cash.

2452. Lord *Clinton.*] This suite, which sold for 55 guineas, you say you got 25 *l.* for?

£. 25 odd.

2453. And was that the original price?

No; 35 *l.*

2454. Then there was a deduction?

A little over 25 *l.* was what I got.

2455. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] What would be the discount taken off in such a case as you mentioned where you were paid 260 *l.* odd,; I mean in your own case?

Five per cent.

2456. Then as to the difficulty in getting business done with other firms after this dispute with Messrs. Maple, do I understand that you suppose that Messrs. Maple communicated with those firms, and that you had a black mark, so to speak, put against you?

No, because when I first had an account with Maples, I did refuse orders from other firms on the faith of the promise that Maples made to me; and on the promise becoming broken with Maples, I tried to open an account with those other firms, and of course could not do so. In the case of one firm in Baker-street, I was compelled to close the account, on account of Maples; they would not allow me to do their orders.

2457. I suppose

2457. I suppose you showed a great deal of annoyance in speaking to Messrs. Maples' manager on some of these occasions?
We had a passage of arms on some occasions.

2458. Did you have a passage of arms before the state of matters became so unpleasant to you?
No.

2459. Lord *Thring.*] I understand that you had a running account both for goods and for money with Maples; is that so?
For goods, not for money.

2460. Then with respect to money, had you a contract for each suite as you call it; you make your goods in suites, as you call it, did you not?
Yes.

2461. Now take the case when you contracted with Messrs. Maple to make a suite; did he tell you what sum he was going to pay you for it?
It was well known he would in the beginning.

2492. Let us take any particular suite, the last that you made; what would you do about it; would you make a contract with Messrs. Maple to make that suite for a particular sum?
Yes; he would ask you what you wanted for it, and you would name a sum, 20 *l.* or 25 *l.*, according to the work on the suite.

2463. And you contracted to make the suite for 25 *l.*, we will say?
Yes.

2464. And you were also bound to take certain goods from him?
The latter part of my time.

2465. For that suite?
Yes.

2466. Then comes the time when you went to be paid; you go to Messrs. Maple and you deliver in goods for 25 *l.*?
Yes.

2467. What do you do then; what does he give you?
You tender him your invoice, and then if you wanted the money in the week you would go upstairs. Say the suite was delivered upon a Wednesday, and you did not want the money out of the usual way, you would go away and wait till Saturday; he would take your invoice, and on Saturday you would go up to the counting-house for the amount; then you would see what you were going to receive.

2468. But you had agreed, I understood?
Yes, we had.

2469. I understood that the sum agreed to by you and Messrs. Maple was 25 *l.*; that contract is binding upon Messrs. Maple?
Yes.

2470. At the conclusion of the time when you ought to be paid you were entitled to receive 25 *l.*?
Less 5 per cent.

2471. Why less 5 per cent.?
They always do take 5 per cent. off.

2472. You made a bargain that it should be 25 *l.*, less 5 per cent.?
Yes.

2473. When you went up to receive the 25 *l.*, less 5 per cent., what was told you?
There is nothing said unless you speak; the amount of the cheque is handed to you.

2474. Then what have you got to complain of?
If you got the amount that you contracted for, of course there was no ground

for any complaint at all; but there was a rule on several occasions that if you were in a necessity, and were wanting the money, and they knew of it, you would not get the amount that you contracted for, but considerably less.

2475. Then I understand your allegation to be this, that though Mr. Maple had contracted to pay you 25 *l.*, less 5 per cent., and although he did pay you 25 *l.*, less 5 per cent., yet if he thought you were pressed for money, what did he do?

He would very likely take 10 per cent. more off, making altogether 15 per cent.; 10 per cent. over and above the 5 agreed upon.

2476. Simply because you were pressed for money?

Yes.

2477. What did he allege to be the reason?

He gave no reason.

2478. Why did not you tell him that you had contracted for 25 *l.*, less 5 per cent?

I have told him on several occasions that it was impossible for me to live and pay the men.

2479. Why did you not say to him, "But I will compel you to pay the money"?

Of course I could; but it was no good a man like me fighting a firm like Maple & Co.

2480. Why not?

Where was I to get the means; where was I to get the money; what should I do in the meantime while the case was pending?

2481. The Court would compel him to pay?

He would take it into the High Court and keep me waiting 12 months.

2482. You did not compel him to pay?

No; I knew my remedy, that I could do so.

2433. That went on for month after month, did it?

Intermediately; perhaps he would give money and give me rest for a time.

2484. Why give rest at one time and not at another?

The only conclusion I came to was that it was because I had not established a sufficient amount of credit in the market to suit him to put the hand down on me at once.

2485. That is why he gave you rest?

That is my opinion.

2646. Because you had not established, or had established credit, which do mean?

I had not at that time.

2487. If he gave you rest in order that you might get yourself up, how do you make out that he afterwards demanded this oppressive sum in order to prevent your getting up?

There was a thorough systematic way of doing it. For instance, when I got my name up for a thorough good amount of credit in the market, then he began and kept it incessantly on till I had to give it up altogether.

2488. I thought you said he gave you a rest because you were not established in the market?

Yes, just at that time.

2489. When you were established in the market he then tried to depress you in the market?

When I had established my name in the market for the purpose of obtaining a certain amount of credit, and had obtained a certain amount of it, he began till he had got the amount of my liabilities and capital, and then left me without anything but my liabilities to meet.

2490. You

2490. You say that Mr. Maple gave you rest in order that you might establish your credit in the market, and that when you had established your credit in the market, then he did all he could to prevent your continuing that credit, is that so?

Yes.

2491. Lord *Monkswell.*] With regard to the 5 per cent., I do not understand that; why should 5 per cent. be taken off at all. I understood you to mean when you first spoke of that 5 per cent., that it was the difference between cash and a cheque, that if you asked for cash you would get the amount, less 5 *l.* per cent., and if you asked for a cheque you would get the whole amount?

No; it is always the rule when a manufacturer serves these houses, and he is paid in cash, or generally at a month, to take $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. off the amount by cheque, and of course I always consider a cheque as good as cash.

2492. But how long would you have to wait to receive the whole sum; supposing you said, "I insist on its being the whole sum that you agreed to pay me, the whole of the 25 *l.*," when could you get it?

The agreement was the 25 *l.*, less the discount off for cash.

2493. Why should it be called 25 *l.*?

It is always called the "gross amount" on the statement, less the discount taken off for cash.

2494. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] When you spoke of an agreement just now, were you referring to a verbal agreement?

We never had anything else.

2495. In that case, though you said you thought you might have had your due, you might have had difficulty in proving your contract, because it would only have been a verbal statement on both sides?

No; I could have distinctly proved the price he paid for the same goods. They would not do it to anybody who was in a position to contest it with them in a court of law.

2496. Did you, or any of your acquaintances, ever ask for a written agreement?

No, I never did.

2497. *Chairman.*] These orders that you get to do, do you execute them all yourself or put any of them out?

I execute them all myself.

2498. You never buy from anybody else?

No.

2499. Or sub-contract them in any way?

No.

2500. Then, as I understand it, your complaint is, the way in which these cheques are treated?

Yes.

2501. That is the only thing you complain of?

If we got out any article of furniture of the newest design which was submitted to Maple; if he liked it, he would generally say that he liked the design, but could not enter into the matter till later in the day, and then he would communicate with a number of other makers to see if he could get it made for less. Another maker could make it for less, because he would take the benefit of your skill in getting out the thing; because he would have it spread before his eyes; then he would quote a lesser sum, and then when you went over to know the result, you would be told that they could get it considerably cheaper.

2502. Lord *Thring.*] Were you not employed by Messrs. Maple to make these designs?

No.

2503. Were you not in their employment when you were making these designs?

No.

2504. Earl of *Onslow.*] Are you aware that you are able to register designs?
Yes.

2505. You did not register them?
No.

2506. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] Have you had the designs of other men given to you to work on in the same way?
Yes.

2507. The designs went for nothing?
Yes.

2508. What is the largest amount you have ever had taken off from any bill?
Twenty-two-and-a-half per cent.

2509. You do not think this is a general system, do you; you only speak of one house?
No, it is not general; I never experienced it before in any other house.

2510. You have not heard other workmen speak of it as existing in other houses?
No.

2511. *Chairman.*] What kind of inspection do your goods undergo when they are brought in?
A pretty smart one.

2512. They are examined?
Yes.

2513. And if they are not quite up to the mark do they make any deduction?
No; as a rule, if they found any fault with my goods I had to set them right.

2514. They would make you take them back?
Yes.

2515. Would they take them at a reduced price?
No. On one occasion he found fault, and took a sovereign off that particular thing.

2516. That is the only case you can remember of the kind?
That is the only case of that that I can call to mind.

2517. Lord *Sandhurst.*] You said that you were paid 25 *l.* for making some furniture, and it was sold for 55 guineas?
Yes, about that sum.

2518. Can you tell me about what the price of the material was; is that included in the 25 *l.*?
That suite cost me 27 *l.* I lost 2 *l.* by that article.

2519. The material cost you 27 *l.*, do you mean?
The material and labour.

2520. *Chairman.*] Of course it makes no difference to you what the cost of the material is when it is supplied by Maples?
Yes it does, because they would take that amount off before you got yours; they would take the amount of the goods they had supplied to you and you would receive the balance; they would make sure of getting theirs first and you would have what is left.

2521. But if you know what the cost of the material is you would name the price accordingly?
Yes, of course you do; but in this instance and several others I did not get it.

2522. Earl of *Onslow.*] You spoke just now of these statements which are handed in; who has the custody of these statements; have you got them or the firm?
The firm.

2523. Have

2523. Have you ever taken any copies of them?
I have copies of them in my book.

2524. Could you supply the Committee with a statement showing your having been paid less on account of having been paid in cash instead of by cheque?
That would be very difficult. For instance, if I had a copy of a statement it would not show anything, because the only statement that would show anything would be in their possession.

2525. But I understand you to say that you have taken copies of the statements, and the statements showed you were not paid that amount; have you got any of those copies?
I have; I could trace some.

2526. Will you supply one to the Committee?
I will endeavour to do so.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

JOSEPH MATTHEW TISSHAW, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

2527. *Chairman.*] WHAT is your business?
A deal worker.

2528. Can you explain what a deal worker is?
I make deal kitchen tables. They used to fetch 7 *s.* 6 *d.* four or five years ago, and now they fetch from 4 *s.* 6 *d.* to 5 *s.*; they are hawked round to the furniture shops. There is another kind of table called a Pembroke table; they are sold for 3 *s.* 6 *d.*

2529. Is that table by you a Pembroke table?
Yes, like that; that is a middle-size one; the smaller size I get 3 *s.* 6 *d.* for. Then I only get 9 *d.* a-piece for making; I could make three in a day, but it takes all my time to sell round the brokers' shops. Another kind of table is 4 feet or 39 inches, which used to be half a guinea, is now sold for 7 *s.*, what is called a breakfast table; about four or five years ago it was sold for half a guinea.

2530. In all these cases, can you tell me what the cost of the wood is now compared to what it was?
A table like this (*pointing*) would cost me 3 *s.* 6 *d.*, and I sell these at 4 *s.* 6 *d.*, and I get 1 *s.* for the making of them.

2531. What would the wood of that have cost you about five years ago?
About 1 *s.* more, I suppose.

2532. Now as to the other kind of tables you mention; I want to find out from you whether the wood of these other kinds of tables you mention would have cost more four years ago than it does now, and if so, how much more?
No doubt a shilling more.

2533. A shilling more in each case?
Yes. Wood which was 4 *s.* 6 *d.* is somewhere about 3 *s.* 9 *d.* or 3 *s.* 6 *d.* now. The legs on these tables used to be 1 *s.* 2 *d.* the four; now they are only 7½ *d.*; and four years ago they used to be sawn out of planks; now they are sawn out of firewood, longish pieces of firewood; but the firewood is a great deal better than what the deal is.

2534. What do you mean by firewood?

(Mr. *Arnold White.*) The firewood he tells me is the external bit of the log that is left after the interior has been cut up into the bundles which the boys sell about the street; and another explanation given behind to me is that

that it is the waste from a large mill which is sold for firewood. (*Witness.*) The legs are better now, because the firewood is harder.

2535. *Chairman* (to the *Witness*).] In what way does this affect you?
The wood is harder to work. I can do as much work as some of the younger ones, but I cannot get it to do. Years ago boxes used to be 27 *s.* a set, but now at the present time they are sold for 12 *s.*, and they are sold for 10 *s.* 6 *d.* The boxes are made now out of egg chests and packing cases.

2536. What do you mean by "boxes"?
Clothes boxes; they go by sets; four in a set, servant's clothes boxes. The Germans make most of these boxes.

2537. How long have you been in this trade?
Forty-eight years.

2538. Do you say that there are a great many Germans making these boxes?
Yes.

2539. How long ago is it since the Germans began to make them?
It might be seven or eight years ago.

2540. Do they also make these tables?
I do not go among the trade; I am always at home, so I do not know.

2541. But how do you know that they make the boxes?
I see them down at the brokers' shops.

2542. What do you do with your tables when you have made them?
Put them on my back, and it may be I go as far as Edmonton with them; sometimes to Tottenham; someone keeps a broker's shop, and he takes of me a table now and then.

2543. Do you always take them to a broker?
Yes; I may hawk them without a license if I take them to the broker's shop, but I cannot hawk them to the public without a license.

2544. Do you mean by the broker the man who sells the thing?
He sells his tables again to the public; the broker is the man who buys them of the maker and sells to the public.

2545. Are there any foreigners employed in your trade?
I cannot tell; I do not go among the trade; I am almost always at home.

2546. Then what you have principally to complain of is, that though the material is got cheaper, the money you get by the table is still less?
A great deal less; and now it takes me half-a-day to walk and sell it.

2547. How do you know what broker will take your table?
I used to go to different brokers.

2548. What you complain of now is that you have to hawk your table about some time before you can get anybody to buy it; that it takes up a great deal of your time?
Yes. Last week I earned 8 *s.* 9 *d.*; this week I do not know what I shall earn, but I cut out two tables this morning before breakfast.

2549. What do you suppose you have earned on an average for the last six months?
Taking one week with another not more than 9 *s.* or 10 *s.* a week.

2550. And what do you pay for rent?
Five shillings. I have been in the same place 36 years; the ceilings have given way, but I have propped them up.

2551. How much could you earn at your trade six or ten years ago?
Ten years ago I might earn 25 *s.* a week.

2552. Lord *Clinton.*] How many rooms have you got for that 5 *s.*?
Two; one is the workshop also. My good lady has got a mangle.

2553. *Chairman.*]

2553. *Chairman.*] You said that ten years ago you could earn 25 *s.*, and now you can only earn 8 *s.* or 9 *s.*; do you account for that entirely by the difference in the price of the tables?

The difference in the prices and the slackness of trade. Of course I could earn a little more money, but I cannot sell them when they are made.

2554. Is your work pretty regular all the year round?

No, it is not.

2555. When do you get the best trade?

About two months before Christmas; there is more trade then than at any other time.

2556. And I suppose you do not know how to account for the bad trade?

No, I do not.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Veneris, 4° *Maii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of CANTERBURY.
Earl of DERBY.
Earl of ONSLOW.
Lord CLINTON.
Lord CLIFFORD OF CHUDLEIGH.
Lord KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord MONKSWELL.
Lord THRING.

LORD KENRY (EARL OF DUNRAVEN AND MOUNT-EARL), IN THE CHAIR.

THE REVEREND WILLIAM ADAMSON, is called in, and having been sworn; is Examined, as follows:

2557. *Chairman.*] YOU are the Vicar of Old Ford?
Yes.

2558. Where is Old Ford?
It lies to the south of Victoria Park, forming the north part of the civil parish of Bow.

2559. About what is the population?
Eleven thousand and sixty-six, by the last Census.

2560. How long have you been vicar?
I have been in charge of that parish, first as minister in charge, and then as the vicar, for 13 years; and I have been in East London for just on 20 years altogether.

2561. So that you have had a long experience of the population of East London generally?
Yes, both in Shoreditch and Bethnal Green, and in Old Ford.

2562. Are there many Jews in your parish?
Not so many in my parish as in some other parishes nearer Stepney, and Spitalfields and Shoreditch; but still there are a number.

2563. And shall you be able to give any evidence as to their condition and circumstances; do they come under your notice at all?
Not in regard to the extreme destitution of the Jewish element; that lies more in Spitalfields and Whitechapel. The destitution that I come across is more in connection with our own native population; but of course I know the customs and habits of the Jews, both the richer Jew who has money, and also the poorer Jew, in connection with the sweating system, and trade, and so on.

2564. But your evidence is chiefly concerned with the Christians?
Chiefly with the Christians, as the workpeople; the agents, middlemen, and sweaters, of course many of them being Jews, living elsewhere in East London, but employing the poor people.

2565. Do you know cases of Jewish masters who employ Christian workmen?
I know of cases of Jewish boot and shoe manufacturers who employ Christian poor in my parish, that is to say, for whom the poor in my parish work.

2566. I meant, rather, do you know cases of Jewish sweaters not large manufacturers, but sweaters, who employ Christian workmen?

Both Jewish sweaters and Christian sweaters.

2567. Do you mean that Jews and Christians work together?

There are Christian workpeople who work for Jewish sweaters.

2568. And work in the same shops with Jews.?

No, these workpeople work at home; they do the work in their own little rooms, and the work is taken to the middlemen, who have larger houses or else little warehouses, in which they store their goods. There are two classes really of sweaters; the sweater direct, who never does any work himself, and who is practically the commission agent of the olden time; and then there is the other class of sweater, who takes out more work than he intends to do; he does a part of it, and the rest he gives out and subdivides; then that subdivision may be subdivided in turn, each subdivision leading to a lower rate, until at last it dwindles down to a mere trifle for the lowest stratum of work. But in my parish itself the manufacturers and sweaters as a rule do not live, except the very poor ones, because it is a wholly poor parish; there is not a middle class house in the whole parish. When I mention that it is not an uncommon thing for a father and mother and five children to live in one, or at the outside, two rooms, you see the condition of things. But this sweating system I may mention is not a thing of modern production. It has always existed, long before I went to East London. We only have it in an aggravated form now. It is the result of civilisation, competition, early marriage, and, necessarily from that, over population. And it is done in all trades. It matters not what trade or profession exists in London, the sweating system, either in its aggravated or in its modified form, exists. The builders and contractors are very often sweaters; though the clauses in their contracts forbid them to sublet their contracts, they break the clauses in their contracts, and sublet. These contracts are again sublet, until perhaps some poor man takes a part of a great building, and he is doing it for a very small fraction compared with the contract prices. That is a large building. I will now take the case of match-boxes, which is a very small article. Ten years ago the poor people in the parish made them in hundreds of grosses at 2¾ *d.* a gross, and found their own paste. I am informed that when the Salvation Army was established they came into competition with the poor, and they offered to do them for 2¼ *d.* The result was that the firms of match-box makers lowered their price to 2¼ *d.* Now comes in the question of sweaters. These match-box firms only employ a certain number of people who take them out in large quantities, and then sub-let them to poor women, who sub-let them at a 1½ *d.* and a 1¾ *d.* the gross, finding their own paste. A woman will, therefore, if she works all day long, day after day, and employs her children when they are away from school, be able to earn from 4 *s.* to 4 *s.* 6 *d.*, or even 5 *s.* a week. There you have two samples of competition; one in a brick building contract; and, on the other hand, one in the making of small match-boxes. In regard to the cause of this aggravated system of competition and commission agency, I attribute it, *first* of all, to the enormous foreign population, Germans and Jews.

2569. Do you mean Germans as distinct from Jews?

Yes, Germans as distinct from Jews. These come to London saying that they leave their own countries for religious causes. I have never met yet with a genuine case of leaving Germany or Russia solely from religious causes; I have invariably found when I have cross-questioned and carefully examined, that the reasons were either a desire to evade military service, or else because the Jews had been so engaged in an illegal spirit traffic, or in public houses in Russia, that the Government had to interfere, and they were, therefore, compelled to seek for a livelihood elsewhere, and having been impoverished, they come to London as the great centre of work. There are Jews undoubtedly, and Germans too, who come to London with money; but a very large number come without money at all, hoping either that their fellow Jews and fellow Germans will help them for a short time, or that they will be able to pick up something as soon as they land. The *second* cause is unquestionably over-population, more especially

especially the preponderance of the female over the male element. No one can view the condition of things in this respect without feelings, to my mind, of the gravest alarm in regard to the future well being of the country itself, both politically and socially. As a *third* cause, I may mention the early marriages. These early marriages very often arise from one or other of three things; either from sleeping in the same room, or in an adjoining room, to lodgers, the girls become pregnant. Sometimes the man is a lodger or a loafer, and he sees a girl in a factory or at work earning a livelihood, and thinks that she will be able to support him. It is only a few weeks ago that Mrs. Adamson was passing along the main thoroughfare of my parish, and she overheard a conversation between three men immediately in front of her, and one man said to the other two, "I am going to get spliced to-morrow." One of the others said, "You spliced! Why," he said, "you have got no work to do; you have been out of work for weeks." "No," he said, "but she is going to keep me till I get work." Another cause is that the man is getting such poor wages, and the girl is also getting poor wages, that they think by putting their two wages together they may manage between them to subsist. The question of remedies as to early marriages, and the evils resulting from them, I would not touch upon now; I am merely giving the causes of the aggravated condition of sweating. A *fourth* cause is undoubtedly very largely the erroneous system of education which exists at present in the country. I know of nothing more conducive to the fostering of the sweating system and to the multiplying of individuals incapable physically and mentally, than the existing system of education. Many of these boys and girls, unless clergymen or philanthrophists come down and feed them at soup kitchens during the winter, or supply them with food, do not receive, when they go to school, nourishment sufficient to enable them to go through the brain work. If they escape paralysis and brain fever their minds and bodies are both debilitated to such an extent, that they are physically, if not mentally, incapable of many occupations in life. Then the education itself is such, that when the boys come out they are fitted only to be boy clerks, and the result of that is, that the market, in London especially, is stocked to overflowing, and boys are known to go now and offer themselves gratis, and even offer a premium, in the City as boy clerks, in the hope that by-and-bye they will get on at a few shillings a week. The result of that is, that hundreds of boys, as well as girls, are idle in London, and they go, in course of time, to swell the criminal population, and create discontent and dissatisfaction in every direction. If they do get married, they marry very often a girl who is earning a few shillings a week in a factory, or by this sweating system, and in that way they manage to live. The education that I would advocate with the view of assisting in the remedy of this, I will explain presently. I may just mention here with regard to the education, that it operates upon the sweating in this form: these boys and girls when they come out at 13, not finding situations, are left on the hands of their parents. The mother must therefore work hard, and the sisters must therefore work hard, at the factories, in order to maintain these boys or their younger sisters, who cannot get employment, but who must be sustained in some form or another. That gives an opportunity to the middleman, the sweater, as it does, of course, to all employers of labour, to insist on lowering the wages or exacting more work for a certain price. I now come to the question of remedies. I may mention that I have here some illustrative cases in all trades, making of furniture, match-boxes, boots and shoes, whether in the stitching or in the riveting; in fact, there is hardly any occupation in which it does not exist; trousers, coats, waistcoats, and mantles, both from the manufactory direct and the sweater too.

2570. Would you wish to read them to the Committee?
It is entirely in the hands of your Lordships.

2571. Are they cases of your own personal knowledge?
Cases of my own personal knowledge, and communicated to me since I came to East London. Of course, as a clergyman, I could not divulge the names given to me in confidence, but they are here.

2572. The Committee would be glad to hear what you have got to say upon this point?

I will take the case of making of boots. I discovered only yesterday what was entirely new to me in regard to a phase of sweating. It seems that there are places, City auction rooms, where the making of boots on a large scale is held up to auction, and the lowest bidder gets the contract. These, I am told, are invariably sweaters, who give out to work-people in small quantities, not giving the price which they themselves have offered at these auction rooms. I do not know whether your Lordships have had this information before you, but it was an entirely new phase of sweating to myself. Another form of sweating is that certain men who have money will take a large house or small factory, and they will employ boys; these are nominally apprentice boys, who will perhaps have managed, through their parents or friends, to have scraped 1 *l.* or 2 *l.* together, and they will pay that to be taught the trade; but they are really employed continually by a constant exchange of fresh boys; as these have been taught the trade they are employed in doing the work which the sweaters give this particular man to do, the result being that the sweater is able to get the goods at a smaller rate. He is not only getting payment for the work they do, but is actually getting a premium as well for the work.

2573. That refers to the boot making?

The boot making, and the riveting, and the lasting. I now come to the regular sweaters, who are occupied in the riveting and lasting. The boots are of course made at different prices, 4 *s.* 6 *d.*, 3 *s.* 6 *d.*, and 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a dozen pairs. Now the regular sweaters pay about one-third to the workers, that is to say, they get 4 *s.* 6 *d.*, and they pay one-third to the poor people whom they employ. I give an illustration, not of this particular fact, but of a development of that system. I am informed that on Wednesday a poor man went into Bethnal Green-road to a boot-making place there, and he asked for work. He was given a dozen pairs of boots, and he was to do them for 4 *s.* a dozen pairs. He went in yesterday with them, and asked for more work. He was offered 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a dozen for cheap work. He said, "I cannot do it; it would cost me 9 *d.* for nails alone; I cannot do it; you had better give me back my security"; and while he was waiting to get back the security which he had had to give, there came in a sweater, and he was asked whether he would take them at 2 *s.* 6 *d.*, and he said (this poor man standing by and hearing it) "Yes, I will take half a gross." He then changed his mind, and said, "I will take a gross." When the gross was settled for, he said, "I will take two gross at 2 *s.* 6 *d.*" Here was a man who came in and was able to take that quantity at 2 *s.* 6 *d.*, when that poor man himself had been compelled to refuse it because it would not have enabled him to live. And this work at 2 *s.* 6 *d.* would, of course, be let out to small people in their little homes, perhaps, at 1 *s.*, 1 *s.* 3 *d.*, and 1 *s.* 6 *d.* I now come to another case of a man working at women's boots, the common quality. From the manufacturers they will get 2¼ *d.* a pair, that is, 2 *s.* 3 *d.* a dozen pairs; but the sweater only gives half that. One man got 1 *s.* 6 *d.* a dozen pairs from the manufacturer; he employed three men at 9 *d.*, and he kept the other 9 *d.* for himself; that is, not three men at 9 *d.* each, but three men at 9 *d.*, and he kept the other 9 *d.* for himself. I now come to the second quality of women's boots, 5 *s.* a dozen pairs taken direct from the manufacturer. The sweater will give 2 *s.* 6 *d.*, that is, exactly half. There are some who take out orders, and they, as I have already mentioned, employ boys at a premium to learn. I have mentioned the case of match-boxes, so that I do not need to enter into that here; but I may mention that the same system applies to furniture, only there is a development in the case of furniture, which your Lordships will see the moment it is mentioned, and that is, that the size of the goods prevents a poor man from storing, and, therefore, he cannot take back and retain in his little room the furniture which he has taken to the manufactory, and which has been refused. What, therefore, does he do? In the case of the man who makes the boots, he can take them back to his house, and put them under his bed, or store them in a back kitchen, or on the premises; but in the case of this individual, he is compelled to go to somebody whom he knows has got the money, and

and has a warehouse or storehouse, and buys his good as a commission agent, or middleman. The poor fellow is compelled to take sometimes less than the value of the materials in order that he may get rid of the thing, because he has no storage for it. I come now to jackets and mantles. If your Lordships will excuse my referring to a very delicate matter in connection with ladies of the West End who wear *silk* mantles, the ladies' best West End silk mantles, there are people in my parish make them, and they get 7½ *d.* for making them right throughout, the whole mantle right throughout, and they have to find their own cotton and silk, and oil for the machine. Now what does the sweater give the poor individual if he comes in between the large manufacturer and the poor person? The sweater gives 5 *d.*, and takes 2½ *d.* for himself.

2574. Do you know what the selling price of those mantles is?

I suppose never under 16 *s.* to 17 *s.* 6 *d.*; very often I suppose pounds, if I may judge from the evidence given in some cases where ladies' husbands and ladies have been summoned before the court; sometimes they pay 25 *l.* or 35 *l.* for a thing of that kind. Of course that is a fancy price, we know perfectly well; but I should imagine that we may say between 16 *s.* and three or four pounds.

2575. Earl of *Onslow.*] You can hardly argue much from that unless you can state what the value of the material is also, can you?

In regard to the difference between the 7½ *d.* and the 5 *d.*, the 7½ *d.* is the price that the manufacturer pays, and the sweater only gives 5 *d.* to the person who does it.

2576. Lord *Thring.*] Have you seen these mantles yourself?

Yes.

2577. Of what material, in your own judgment, are they; do you mean to tell us that mantles of the most expensive silk or velvet are committed to these poor people?

The very best ladies' West End *silk* mantles; not velvet.

2578. Velvet work, a 1 *l.* a yard?

I am no judge in regard to the price.

2579. Very valuable velvets and silks?

I do not say anything about velvets; *silks entirely*, to my knowledge. The same applies to the second rate ladies' mantles. There they get 5 *d.* from the manufacturer, and the sweater will give 3 *d.* or 3½ *d.* for each; they can do about two of these a day; that is, they can earn from 1 *s.* 3 *d.* to 1 *s.* 6 *d.* a day working at these mantles. I may add, without referring to the particular individuals, that I know that this one person whom I am now keeping in my mind's eye seldom tastes meat from one year's end to the other. I do not know whether your Lordships want any information in regard to the wages and work, apart from the system of sweating, or whether it must be limited entirely to that.

2580. *Chairman.*] Our inquiry is limited to the sweating system, which is rather difficult to define?

I come now to the question of bead trimmings, which are put on dresses and mantles. Of course they are of different kinds; there is the very small light bead trimming, and there is the very elaborate and heavy and expensive trimming. In regard to these bead trimmings, direct from the factory they are 10 *d.* to 1 *s.* a gross. A person can make about three-quarters of a gross a day, that is can earn from 8 *d.* to 1 *s.* a day, working from eight o'clock in the morning till eight o'clock at night. Some of the very clever hands can make 1 *s.* to 1 *s.* 2 *d.* a day. In the case of the larger and better bead trimming of a heavy and more expensive character, these are got by the sweater at 3 *s.* 6 *d.* a dozen, and the sweater will give 1 *s.* 4 *d.* a dozen for them. The same applies practically to men's coats and to knickerbocker suits. The boys' knickerbocker suits are made at 5¾ *d.* a suit throughout, the person finding her own cotton and oil. The same applies to the shirt making; it applies equally to the brush making and the brush-wire drawing, the drawing of the wires

through the brushes for the fastening of the bristles in the brushes. The same obtains in regard to the waistcoat making and the trousering, the difference between the coats, waistcoats, and trousers being that the men are mostly employed on the coats, and that women do the trousers and waistcoats almost wholly. I think I have omitted to mention the mackintoshes. The best waterproof mackintoshes are obtained from the factory, the work being paid at the rate of 1 *s.* 5 *d.* for each. Two of these can be made a day, working from eight till eight. In common waterproofs it obtains in the same way; they are made at 1 *s.* 2 *d.* each. Under the sweating system the sweater takes for the best, that is the 1 *s.* 5 *d.* set, 5 *d.* to himself; and for the common set, that is the 1 *s.* 2 *d.* order, he takes 4 *d.* Unless your Lordships wish anything special in regard to these trades, I will not trouble your Lordships further than just to refer to the question of remedies.

2581. Perhaps it would be convenient to ask you a few questions on these particular points before you go into the question of remedies. I should like to ask you if you can give the Committee any information as to the sanitary condition of the houses which these people work in?

I went the day before yesterday into one little room where there was a bedstead and three machines. The room was occupied by the bedstead and the three machines, and I had just to stand inside the door in order to speak. The windows were shut, and your Lordships may judge of the sanitary condition of that room when I say that, accustomed as I am to these things, I was quite giddy when I came down from the room. The bed was covered with boots and shoes in all stages of progress, the floor was the same, and there was paste, and other materials that they use, smelling in the room. That is the sort of thing.

2582. How many people were there?

There were three people only in that little room; it was just a very small room.

2583. As I understand you, most of the work you have alluded to is carried on in the peoples' own dwelling-houses?

In the peoples' own dwelling houses.

2584. In the event of any infectious disease among their children, would they still be going on with this work?

I am afraid I must cast a reflection upon the medical faculty so far as giving information of these things is concerned; I think they withhold information as to disease. I know that my experience in *East London* has been that when statements have appeared in the newspapers from medical authorities that there was no such thing raging, I have known it raging around me. We can trace it from house to house, from upstairs lodgers to downstairs lodgers, arising from constant communication of article with article, and person with person. I have known in East London that an epidemic of scarlet fever has been raging off and on, more or less, for 18 months.

2585. And work of this description going on in the house?

Work taken into the places, and some of the children sent to the Board school, although the malady was in the house. I have had them sent even to my own Sunday schools, and I have had to send them away. The parents do not look upon it in the same way as we do, they do not regard it as a terrible thing; they think nothing of sending the children to school even with those infectious cases in their houses. They take the work. Of course there are some cases in which they would be far too honest to practise anything of that kind.

2586. Take the case of these silk mantles you spoke of; is all the work upon them done in one room, or do they go to different houses to have different parts of the work done?

In the case of the silk mantles, they are made throughout, entire; the material received and the article completed for taking to the warehouse.

2587. Then in the case of the other work to which you alluded, coats and vests and trowsers, do they pass through many hands?

In

In the case of trousers they would go through two at least, because the button-holes have to be made; there is the button-hole-maker, and the finisher, and the man who tacks and sews preparatorily. In regard to the boots, the same thing applies there; one person will take them to stitch, another to rivet with nails the soles, so that these things pass through different hands.

2588. Do you think that an infectious disease is carried and propagated in that way by goods being passed from hand to hand, and into different houses?
I am quite sure of it.

2589. These coats and trousers and vests that you spoke of, do they also go to the best shops in the West, in the same way as the mantles?
The best coats do, but not as a rule the trousers; they go more I think to the City, and a great many of them are sent abroad; huge quantities of clothing go to the Colonies.

2590. But some of the better class of coats do go to the West End shops?
Unquestionably.

2591. With the exception of the boot-making, most of the work you have mentioned is done by women, is it not?
Furniture, of course, is made by men, and the boots made by men, and the coats made by men.

2592. The clothes are made partly by men and partly by women?
Yes.

2593. But the mantles and match-boxes are not made by men?
They are all made by women and children almost entirely.

2594. About these match-boxes, have you any knowledge as to the hours for which the children work?
I have known them begin work at six o'clock in the morning, and I have known them work at them steadily until 11 and 12 o'clock at night.

2595. The children?
No, the mothers; the children could not do it because they are at school. But children in East London do not retire to rest in the same way as in the middle and upper classes; their accommodation is such that they cannot send them to bed before a very late hour, and therefore they are either in the streets until a very late hour at night, or else engaged with their mothers in making match-boxes and other things.

2596. This work is carried on in their own rooms?
Yes.

2597. Earl of *Onslow.*] Do young persons, children over the school age, work in these match factories?
In the large match factories they have an immense number of girls; in all, say, as many as 1,500 or 2,000 young girls.

2598. But I mean in the workshops to which you have been referring?
These are not workshops; perhaps one room; a family hires one room.

2599. I am asking about those who are older than the school age, just over the school age?
If their mothers are making the match-boxes, and these girls have got no employment either in factories or offices, they will do it, if the parents can keep them indoors; but they are very likely running about the streets, watching an opportunity for what they can get.

2600. *Chairman.*] I want to ask you about the boys you spoke of as being employed; they are employed, I understand you, not in their own homes but in shops?
Yes, *workshops.*

2601. What do you mean by a boy; how do you define a boy?
When he leaves school, 13 years of age, between 13 and 18.

2602. Do you know anything about the hours of labour to which they are subjected?

I could not fix any hours, but I know the hours are very heavy indeed; I know in the case of one girl in regard to waistcoats, she is employed from seven o'clock in the morning until eleven o'clock at night; she is a girl of 16.

2603. Is there any furrier's work done in your parish?

I am not aware of sweating; I have the fur trade down, and I think I have some information on it, but not in regard to sweating; whatever sweating there is in the fur trade is done elsewhere.

2604. I did not quite understand what you mean by saying that the Salvation Army have come into competition with the match-box makers?

They offered, I understand, to make the match-boxes for the large firms at $2\frac{1}{4}$ *d.*, when the people had previously been getting $2\frac{3}{4}$ *d.*

2605. Do you mean members of the Salvation Army living in your parish?

No, the organised Salvation Army from head-quarters. I understand that when the Salvation Army was started at the Congress Hall, as they call it, at Clapton, then they competed with the poor people at $2\frac{1}{4}$ *d.*, when they had previously been getting $2\frac{3}{4}$ *d.*

2606. Do you know where the work was done?

I do not, unless it was done at workshops connected with the Congress Hall.

2607. *Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Do you mean that the officers of the Salvation Army give this work out?

Not to residents outside, but I suppose to the members of the Salvation Army. The male and female members live in barracks, I believe.

2608. In the same way as the laundry work?

Yes; I am told that they competed in regard to the laundry work, and that the prices of laundry work came down accordingly.

2609. *Chairman.*] You spoke about one poor man unable to do the work at the price offered, asking to have his security back; what is the security required?

In these cases, where they are not regular hands, they require to give security for the goods which are handed out.

2610. What is the nature of the security; money?

Money for the value of the goods, or they must have a guarantee from somebody known that they will be responsible, one or the other. They do not give out these goods to an unknown individual without security.

2611. What I wanted to find out was this: if money is demanded, how these people, whom you describe as being so poor, can find the money, because you spoke of mantles that might be worth 20 *l.* or 25 *l.* a piece?

I can very easily explain that to your Lordship. The Mansion House Relief Fund, two years ago, gave me a very great insight into how money was raised. I had frequently to go to pawnshops with people and get out their various articles, not only of furniture and wearing apparel, but even carpenter's tools and machines, and necessary things for working, which had been pawned in order to raise money enough to guarantee and give security. Many poor people, when they have not the money, go and pawn an article in order to raise money.

2612. You have stated that the sweating system has always existed more or less, but that at present the East End of London is suffering from it in an aggravated form?

Yes.

2613. To what do you attribute that aggravation; you mentioned immigration, I think?

I mentioned the foreign population, the over-population especially amongst females, and early marriages. If his Grace will forgive my just mentioning it here,

here, it it quite possible to alleviate that mischief somewhat, if we can only induce the clergy of the Church of England and Nonconformist ministers carefully to comply with the Act of Parliament which, I believe, requires that the clergy should not marry persons under 21 without the parents or guardians being present

2614. Lord *Thring.*] We understood yesterday from a witness before another Committee, that if the banns have been published, or the names have been put up in a registry office, the registrar or minister was bound to marry them?

I do not know about the registrar, but I believe his Grace can clear up that point as to whether clergymen can marry minors unless the parents or guardians are present. I know many of the clergy have been under the impression that they have no right to marry persons under 21 unless the parents or guardians are present.

2615. *Chairman.*] I want to call your attention to that particular case you gave us of a poor man who took out some work, boots I think it was, for a certain price, and when he brought it in, was offered more work of a similar kind at a very much lower price?

Not similar work; other work at the lower price of 2 *s.* 6 *d.* Of the work at 4 *s.* a dozen pairs which he took in, there was no more for him, and he was offered other work at 2 *s.* 6 d., which he would not take.

2616. That was what I wanted to know. I understood you to mean that a reduction from 4 *s.* 6 *d.* to 2 *s.* 6 *d.* was made in the price offered him for similar work?

Not for *similar* work.

2617. But at any rate the work offered to the man he declined because he felt it impossible to take it at the price?

Yes.

2618. And then you told us that a sweater came in and took it with avidity?

Yes.

2619. I want you to explain, if you can, how it is that the sweater could do the work at that price, whereas a man accustomed to do the work said it was impossible, owing to the fact that he had to give 9 *d.*, as you said, for the nails?

The explanation is this: that the sweater has a large number of people always on his list, and he knows that they are ready to do it for whatever figure he may fix, that the starvation life of the poor is such that they are compelled at last to take anything that is offered them, in order that they may earn something. I will give an illustration of that. Here is the case of a girl selling bags in the Smithfield Market. These bags are sold for 1 *d.* a piece in the Smithfield Market.

2620. What kind of bags?

Little handbags made of fibrous material. You can go and buy a leg of mutton, or a fowl, or anything else, and it is put into this bag: you will buy one outside the market for a penny. She sold six of these, and brought home 6 *d.* There was not another farthing in the house, not a morsel of bread. The family divided the 6 *d.* in this way: 3 *d.* for more stuff to make fresh bags; 3 *d.* for the following meal four four people; A penny for coal to light the fire, a halfpenny for tea, a farthing for milk, and a penny farthing for half a loaf of bread. That was a meal for four people. I take another case: A family which I know earned 6d. They had no more food and no money. They bought three pennyworth of sheeps' trotters, two pennyworth of potatoes, one pennyworth of carrots, stewed it up, and that was a dinner such as they seldom had from one year's end to the other. When they are so hard pushed to obtain money it is a very easy matter for a sweater to get any price he may choose to fix. He has only to go to a woman who is very anxious about her children, and say, "I will give you so much." The poor woman may be broken-hearted at the bare idea; she may work 10, 12, 14 and even 20 hours at a stretch; she is doing it because somebody must find the bread, and the husband is either out of work or else not earning sufficient to support the large family.

2621. I suppose the sweater in this particular case you mentioned would himself make a large profit?

A large profit.

2622. Therefore he would get the work done by the worker for very much less than he himself would receive?

Quite so; the fact that I have not yet known, during the 20 years that I have been in East London, a middleman, so called bankrupt, or in money difficulties, speaks for itself.

2623. Have you any idea what amount of capital it requires for a man to set up as a sweater middleman?

There could be no fixed amounts. A man may do it on a few pounds, even a few shillings; or he may do it on a large scale, on a large sum; but, I apprehend, if a man has a little connection he may do it for 3 *l.*, 4 *l.*, or 5 *l.* to begin with, sweating in a small way. Then your Lordships must remember that this sweating system is carried right down to the very lowest stratum of the poor. I take, for instance, the match-box sweater; one family will do it in the street. There may be five or six women in that same short street of 10 or 12 houses, who will take it out at a 1 *d.* and a 1¾ *d.* from this individual who is getting it just at a 1¼ *d.* higher; so that the sweating goes on, not only amongst the middlemen, who have plenty of money, but amongst the Christians and the Jews, and down to the very lowest stratum and the poorest.

2624. We had one witness who stated that on one occasion he had worked forty hours at a stretch; has anything approaching that come under your observation?

Never.

2625. Do you know cases of men working 22, or 20, or 18 hours?

Yes, I have known them work 22 hours; but I have never known of 25 hours at a stretch.

2626. I should like to know what you would consider a not unnatural day's work; I mean a not abnormal day's work?

It is hardly possible to say that, because so much depends upon the physique of the individual, as well as upon the character of the work.

2627. I mean, how many hours, in your experience, would be a not unusual thing for men to work; 18 or 20?

If they work from eight in the morning till eight at night, it is very fair.

2628. But do you know many cases where they work for longer?

Yes. I have known cases where they began to work at three and four in the morning, and would go on to 11 or 12 o'clock at night.

2629. Then 18 or 20 hours would not be exceptional, in your experience?

Yes, I think so; an unbroken stretch of 20 hours would be an exceptional time.

2630. I want to get at what is not exceptional; is 18 not exceptional?

I think I would rather say 15 is not exceptional.

2631. I want to ask you just one question about these immigrants that come in; you say that many of them come in without any money?

Yes.

2632. Do you know how they get funds to come over here?

I understand that there are agencies and associations amongst them by which they are enabled to come over here; that applies especially to the Jews; but I am informed that in regard to the German immigrants their relatives in their own country find the money, just as we do in this country for sending emigrants to Canada and elsewhere; very often the relatives make up the amount of the passage between them.

2633. I was referring rather to the Jews?

I believe there are associations by which the Jews are sent away from those countries.

2634. Associations

2634. Associations over here or over there?
Associations over there, to get rid of the surplus Jewish poverty-stricken population.

2635. Are most of the people to whom you have referred during your evidence, Christians or Jews?
Christians, in the case of the poor workpeople. There were two cases I mentioned this morning of Jews, but they have become naturalised Jews; they have lived so many years in this country that they are practically regarded as belonging to our own country; they have all the privileges of it.

2636. Do you find any difficulty in getting information from the people; in getting at the truth of the facts?
I never used to find difficulty; but since this Committee has been sitting, I have had been very much impressed with the fact that the men are most unwilling to give the least information of any kind. I could before always ask them, and have had no difficulty in obtaining information, but they are on the *qui vive* now; the men especially. The women are more communicative; but even they, I think, have been warned. I have had one or two women connected with my benefit fund (which is an enormous one; hundreds of women belong to it), who have never before refused me information, who have point blank told me in the last fortnight that they refused it on account of this Committee sitting.

2637. In fear of losing their work?
I cannot give a case in which a sweater or employer has threatened, but I can see perfectly well that either the people are afraid needlessly, or that they have been warned of the consequences if they give information; one or other of the reasons.

2638. For instance, if you wished to bring down witnesses here to corroborate what you have said yourself, would you find it difficult to get them to come?
I could not get one to come. I asked one yesterday, who, of all in the parish I might have expected would be willing, as having been greatly helped by me and by Mrs. Adamson in former times, and he simply refused, and quietly told me; "You will get none of us to give you information." They are afraid of their names appearing in the newspapers, and in that way reaching either the middleman or their employers. It may be that in one or two cases they hope to be sweaters themselves by-and-bye, and therefore they do not want to say anything against the system, because, if the men save two or three pounds in one form or another, they may take their share and ultimately become possessors of houses, as I know many middlemen now are, and accumulate property.

2639. Lord *Thring*.] I understand that your evidence really refers to what you call family workshops, or domestic work amongst the Christian population; you refer to work in the houses of the people themselves done by one family?
Except in the case of the boys which I mentioned, where the boys are apprenticed to a man who opens a small factory, and employs boys as apprentice hands.

2640. But as a general rule we understand your evidence to refer to the house working?
House working entirely; family life work.

2641. With respect to these mantles which come to the West End shops, are they what is called bespoke work, or are they made for the wholesale shops?
They may be both.

2642. Supposing a lady orders a mantle at the West End, one of these extremely valuable silk mantles, I understand it would be sent down to the East End to some one in your parish?
It may be sent to Soho, or to that neighbourhood.

 2643. But

2643. But some of them do come into the East End?
Undoubtedly.

2644. With respect to the commission agents, you say these sweaters are commission agents; I cannot understand how the condition of the poor in your neighbourhood is aggravated by the commission agent. Take the case of the West End shop which sends its mantles to one of your East End people; how can you do it otherwise than by a commission agent?
I do not for a moment say that the system is aggravated by a commission agency; I do not assign that as one of the reasons. The reasons are the foreign population, the early marriages and over population, and the system of education.

2645. You do not blame the sweaters, the commission agents *qua* men; you simply are attacking the evils of the whole system?
Yes; the system of commission agency must exist in all trades so long as trade exists; it is only that advanced civilization and competition and over population lead to these evils.

2646. You depict the miseries of excessive competition and excessive population; that is your point, is it not?
Yes, to a certain extent; but a sweater is a human being.

2647. But he is not merely, because he is a middleman, worse than any other human being?
No, but if he finds that he can get his work done at the very lowest figure, the utilitarian character of the age is such that it does not matter whether it is an ox, or an ass, or a man, he gets it out of him.

2648. Supposing we could create an agency by which a West End shop could hand those mantles directly over to one of these poor people instead of having the intermediate agency of one of these agents, would it be any better?
You cannot do it; your legislation would be of no avail

2649. I do not mean legislation; but supposing it could be done with the assistance of a charitable organisation, or some organisation of that sort, which should in some degree act the part of middleman between the great houses and the small workers, do you think it would be any better?
Very much better indeed.

2650. You think the wages would be higher?
Yes, and there would be other influences at work. My poor parishioners would come in direct contact with a higher class of London society, and sympathies would be drawn out which otherwise lie dormant. The middleman unquestionably destroys sympathy between the poor and the better class tradesmen at the West End.

2651. And you think something might be done by some sort of charitable organisation in that way; could you suggest anything?
I can suggest things which will alleviate the existing evils.

2652. Supposing a society of ladies at the West End to resolve that they would interpose, and that they would themselves get these mantles transferred from the West End, as I will call it, to the East End den of misery, do you think that would be of any avail?
If it were possible it would, but it is an impracticable thing; if it were practicable, it would, unquestionably.

2653. You think what is required, if possible, is more sympathy and better wages?
Not wholly.

2654. Earl of *Derby*.] I do not quite understand from the evidence you have given what there is that prevents the employer from dealing direct with the workman. What is it that prevents the workman from going direct to the employer, or the employer from dealing immediately with him, without a large proportion

proportion of the workman's wages, and therefore probably also the employer's profits, being absorbed by the middleman?

I will take the case of a large manufacturer, it may be that he wants to save himself the trouble of having a number of poor people coming about his premises; he therefore will employ a man who will take the work away in a large quantity; he is saved time and trouble, without having any people coming hanging about his premises.

2655. Then in point of fact the middleman is a convenience to the manufacturer, whatever he may be to the person employed?

Undoubtedly a very great advantage to the manufacturer; in this way also, that the manufacturer does not require to build large factories, as a rule, but he will merely have a warehouse to receive the goods that are made.

2656. Then I suppose we may take it that this middleman system has arisen in the ordinary course of trade?

Quite so, and the aggravation, too, in the same way.

2657. And the real trouble is that, as you said just now, these workmen and workwomen are obliged, by their poverty, to take any wages that are offered?

Yes.

2658. In point of fact, therefore, it resolves itself into this, that the supply of workers is greater than the local demand for it?

It is demand and supply.

2659. Now, you spoke of the effects of immigration; do you consider that the foreign immigration adds any large percentage to the native population; is it appreciable?

In London unquestionably. We have an immense influx of the foreign element continually into London, and more especially into East London; because, although many French people come to Soho and the neighbourhood of the west slums, yet, when they arrive at their destination in the Thames, they settle down in the immediate vicinity, and very likely never move away. I will give an illustration of this in the case of a Jew. He came not very long ago from one of the provinces of Austria. When he came to the port of London he had only two or three shillings in his pocket, and he had the addresses of some Jewish persons. He was adrift in Whitechapel, and he had to be directed through the kindness of an Englishman to the addresses outside London where these Jewish acquaintances were. He went to them, and he lived with them for a few weeks each until he managed to find sufficient employment to subsist, and he is now at work in East London. That is merely a typical case.

2660. You have seen a great deal of these foreign immigrants; can you tell us what character they generally bear; are they sober?

The foreign element is essentially a sober one compared with the English, I grieve to confess it.

2661. As far as you are aware, are they inferior in morality to the native population?

No, but they are inferior in sanitation; they are more likely by their habits and customs to create and foster diseases; the people crowd together, and they do not keep themselves so cleanly.

2662. Their habits are very dirty?

Compared with the general English habits, they are.

2663. There is another thing which you said about which I should like to ask a question. You have referred two or three times to the education which the boys and girls get as not being suitable; in what respect is it not suitable, what is it that you find fault with?

First of all, the system strains both the body and brain during the school time up to 13 years of age. These children are probably the anæmic offspring of mothers who during their pregnancy were half starved, and therefore the children were born of an anæmic character. They go into the schools and do not

not get food. I know many children who, if I had not feed them with a luncheon or dinner, would have had their brains ground with these subjects, when they had not had a morsel of food since they came home the night before.

2664. It is not that they are badly educated, then, but that they are half starved?

That first. Now I come to the other point, the education itself. The education is of too high a class. These boys and girls are turned out good writers and good arithmeticians, and if you can furnish for them an unlimited field of employment, then the education is all right; but when you are sending out wholesale one class of boy and girl, all educated to one standard, and all educated in the same subjects, you create an enormous amount of material, and there is no demand for them. I am told that they go down in hundreds and thousands to the city and compete; that sometimes as many as 200 boys will compete for one boy clerkship; they will even offer to go for nothing in the hope that they will get two or three shillings a week by-and-by; they are unfitted for manual labour. A very simple illustration of this may be given in connection with girls. A girl of 13 goes into service. She has been taught the theory of house cleaning, she has been taught by her books how to handle a broom and scrub. When she goes into the house she does not even know how to handle a broom or how to scrub; she has only had the theory of domestic work, and she has had no practical training. What is the result in the case of girls? They go into factories and they take up this kind of work for two or three shillings a week; and if this is not known to his Grace, I will ask his Grace to consider this in connection with the moral question. Many of these girls have no choice, I was going to say, so far as their wish to be dressed nicely is concerned; the wages are not enough for them, and there are some of them who at 13 years of age are leading an immoral life. I may mention a case which was brought to my knowledge of two sisters, one of 12, the other of 10. One girl followed me in the street; she was walking somewhat lame, and I said to her, "Where do you live?" She would not tell me where she lived. I said, "I will follow you now and all day long, if it is necessary, until I find out where you live." She went into a public house to escape from me. I went in also, and then she gave up eluding me and told me where she lived. I went there, and I found that her stepmother sent her out for prostitution at that age, and that she was expected to bring home ninepence. Why? Because the family said they had to live. That girl was taken by me to the Lock Hospital, and when she was well she was sent into a situation in Devonshire, into service. If the clergyman by whom she was thereby rescued had not been in East London the poor girl would have been left in that condition. It arises entirely from the unfitness of these individuals for any manual or domestic employment.

2665. Earl of *Onslow*.] With reference to the immorality amongst the young children, you are aware probably that an Act of Parliament was passed a year or two since inflicting very heavy penalties upon persons who were connected with that; has that not been enforced in the part of London with which you have to do?

It has been very effective indeed in regard to young girls, but of course not a few of the factory girls who earn at these large factories a few shillings a week are immoral; their evenings are spent in earning more money in that fashion; and lately it has been well known that the magistrates have had to take up some of these nuisances in the main thoroughfares of East London, because the thoroughfares became absolutely dangerous for respectable people to walk in.

2666. My question rather referred to those of very tender years?

It has certainly improved since that Act.

2667. You have no complaint to make of the action of the police in prosecutions where violation of the Act is brought under their notice?

Not at all in regard to that.

2668. With

2668. With regard to this particular case which you brought under the notice of the Committee, how was it that no prosecution was undertaken?

That was before this Act was passed; that was one of the cases which came before the individuals who brought the Act forward.

2669. Then since the Act was passed you are of opinion that it has been distinctly productive of good?

Yes, certainly.

2670. You told the Committee, I think, that one of the reasons why the sweating system had attained its present proportions was on account of the increase of the population and of the disproportionate number of females to males?

Yes.

2671. Is that of recent growth?

It is increasing unquestionably. There are more females now than used to be years ago.

2672. I have been looking at the figures of the Census of 1881, and I find that in Bow there were 18,751 females and 18,323 males; in St. George's-in-the-East there were 23,546 females and 23,611 males; and in Whitechapel there were 15,006 females and 15,654 males; is it your opinion that since the Census return of 1881 the proportion has been materially altered?

Not only since 1881, but before. The statistics viewed in one way are safe, but viewed in another are very unsafe.

2673. Will you explain that?

For instance, the female emigration is much larger, more extensive, and therefore, though there are many more females born, they do not appear in the Census when the time comes round, because they have been sent abroad to the Colonies.

2674. But surely at the time that the Census is taken, on the day that the Census is taken, you do not contest the accuracy of the Return?

I am afraid I would. I do not think that the Census returns which are taken every year are accurate or correct. I have known case after case within my knowledge, as an East London clergyman, in which the returns have not been according to the residents in the house; I have had these statements made to me by the individuals themselves; and you never will or can get an accurate census either as to the ages or number of residents in the house.

2675. Confine yourself, please, to the question of males and females?

If your Lordship meant to ask whether I knew of cases in which a return was made of a male for a female, or a female for a male, I have never known anything of that kind.

2676. We may assume that, so far as that goes, the Census was accurate?

I would rather not put myself forward as an authority on that question. My own experience of evidence from day to day is that there is a preponderance of the female element, and that that preponderance is increasing, and not diminishing.

2677. What reason have you for stating that fact, which, apparently, is in total opposition to the figures which have been laid before Parliament?

I give two reasons on the spur of the moment: one is, that in visiting as a clergyman, from house to house, I note the numbers of females in proportion; another is the immense number of girls that are being employed in factories of all kinds, which are springing up like mushrooms all over the East of London, and in the suburbs; and I think there is a third which may be probably brought forward, and that is the large increase of the girls over the boys in the schools; but that, I think, is a minor one; the other two seem to me, on the spur of the moment, to be the chief reasons.

2678. And you have complained of the existing law with regard to education, on the ground, as I understand it, that it educates the mind, but makes no provision for the body?

It enfeebles, on the one hand, or, if the individual becomes proof to it and is not enfeebled, it does not give an education suitable to the future expectations of the child.

2679. Would it be your view that, instead of education being confined to the subjects which are now taught in the schools, it should be extended to technical instruction in those branches of trade which the children are likely hereafter to adopt?

The present Chairman of the London School Board, Mr. Diggles, asked my opinion on that question some time ago, and to the previous chairman I had by letter expressed my views on the education question, that the alteration ought to be made; and I think it would largely influence this question of the sweating altogether if it were done; that up to a certain age the children should be taught the ordinary rules, say until they are 11 or 12, and that the rest of their time at school should be half time, and the other half of the day should be spent in workshops learning carpentering and trades of all kinds; the girls having to do domestic work in the way of laundry work, and ironing and washing, and so on, for the last year or two of the child's education; if that were done you would turn out in all kinds of trades, boys and girls already fitted to enter upon the solemn responsibilities of working for their own independence; in that way early marriages would be deprived of a great deal of the evil that now exists, because now before they have learnt anything, or know anything of those solemn responsibilities, they contemplate marriage.

2680. We have been told on this Committee that one of the great causes of the evils of the sweating system is the competition of unskilled labour, and I take it, therefore, that your evidence rather tends to show that if you could give the labourers some skill they would be employed, and the unskilled labour would be driven out of the market, is that your view?

Provided you get rid of the difficulty of the over-population; you could never alter it unless the difficulty of over-population was also surmounted, because there are always employers, and, therefore, there would always be sweaters ready at hand to seize upon the unskilled labour and utilise it, for the simple reason that there would always be a market for cheap goods and goods improperly made. Imagine a skilled and an unskilled worker upon a pair of trousers; the article itself will only show to the skilled employer where it is defective, but the purchaser, when he buys it, does not know the difference between the skilled and unskilled stitches till he comes to wear the trousers; but he has paid the tradesman for the trousers.

2681. In order to avoid this evil, which I am willing to admit, of education for the mind and want of education for the body, would you suggest that there should be any provision made for feeding the children as well as educating them at school?

The existing system of feeding children in board schools is to my mind mischievous and unjust. It is mischievous to the whole morale of the children, and it is unjust to the teaching staff; and I hold, from the experience of years as a school manager, and also as a clergyman, having soup kitchens, that by far the best system is to have the feeding of the children entirely apart from the board schools, neither coming out of the rates nor being cooked or prepared inside, nor being conducted by the teachers in any shape or form; that it should be done wholly outside the board school system, and either by voluntary effort or official organization, so that the children could go to these large places and get their dinners in the middle of the day, apart altogether from the School Board *régime*.

2682. Then you do not suggest that those who pay for the education of the mind should pay for the food for the body; that is, the ratepayers, of course, in Board Schools; you are opposed to that?

Thoroughly; I am afraid that I am also equally opposed to the existing system of the ratepayers having to pay for the mental training.

2683. Now,

2683. Now, I understood you to complain of the division of the earnings between the sweater and the sweatees?

Yes.

2684. You stated, I think, that one-half was taken by the sweater and the remaining half was divided amongst the *employés*?

Sometimes one-third only is given to the *employés*; there is no fixed proportion; it depends very much upon the sweater, and also upon the demand that there is for a particular thing, and it depends upon that sweater's knowledge of the circumstances of the family whom he employs, and he is a shrewd man of of the world, and he takes care to make his prices according to his knowledge of these things.

2685. But, I presume, if the sweatees do not contribute anything towards the rent or towards the material used (which we have been told is usually termed "grindery" in the boot making trade), all that falls upon the sweater, does it not.

It is very little; where the workpeople make it in their own houses, they take it merely to the sweater's house; it may be a large one, and he simply stores it there till the carts that are outside take it off.

2686. But does he not pay the entire rent of that house?

Yes; probably it is his residence, and he lives there with his whole family.

2687. Is it not fair that the person who pays for the rent and the "grindery" should take a larger proportion than the persons who do the work, because, in every case, I understand, he also does work himself?

Quite so. I do not reflect upon the middleman and sweater in my evidence to day, *qua* middleman and sweater; it is his business, and his anxiety is to obtain money, but I complain of the evils which have grown up through the over population and the competition which prevails.

2688. But is it your opinion that the sweatee is to be much more commiserated than the sweater?

Decidedly. I have never known a sweater in poverty; they are always in affluence as far as I have known them, and they are able, not only to put money into the funds, but to buy houses and lands, while the poor sweatees, or their children, may have had to feed sometimes from the 1st of November to the 1st of May at the soup kitchens.

2689. The sweaters work the same number of hours as the sweatees, do they not?

No; sometimes the sweaters do not work at all. There are two kinds of sweaters; sweaters who never work, and sweaters who do a certain amount, and these latter do not work as hard as the under-sweatees at all.

2690. There is one other point, and that is with regard to the position of the foreigners; the foreign sweatees, are they more willing to put up with the discomfort of long hours and the bad food than our English workmen would be?

Yes, I do not know why it is, but it is a fact, that the foreigner can subsist on cheaper and poorer food than the Anglo-Saxon, and that a German, or a Jewish *employé* is able to stand the hard work and the poor food, which would leave the Anglo-Saxon workman absolutely nerveless and exhausted.

2691. Very much commiseration has been expressed for the unfortunate condition of these sweatees, but is it your opinion that the Jewish and the German sweatee is otherwise than fairly satisfied with his condition in life; I do not say he would not be glad to better it, but is he not fairly satisfied on the whole with the terrible terms he has to live under?

No; it may be that he has learnt to bear it better because he can put up with the unsanitary conditions and the poor food, but he is as discontented every way as the Anglo-Saxon sweatee.

2692. Lord *Clinton*.] You complain very much of the sweating system and its effect upon your parishioners, but is it not the existence of the sweater or the

the contractor which enables many of your parishioners to get any work at all?

If he did not exist the manufacturer would have to employ these workpeople directly.

2693. But that cannot be done apparently?

It can be done, but it will not be done; it is not the interest of the large manufacturing employer that it should be done, because he saves himself time and trouble by the adoption of the middleman and the sweater. I will take, for instance, a firm mentioned this morning. It is quite to their interest that they should employ middlemen, and get all their goods and so on manufactured, not caring where, so long as they do not have the trouble connected with the paying of wages and the keeping of books, and having huge premises, factories, and so on. I do not mention that firm invidiously, but merely to show that it is done as a simple matter of business.

2694. With regard to your figures about the females, could you give any figures as to the increase of females in your parish schools?

I have no parish schools; they are all Board Schools. No; I could not give the figures.

2695. Lord *Sandhurst.*] In regard to these children, as a rule, they go to school in a half-starved condition, a good many of the poorest of them, I understand you to say?

A good many of the poorest, unless they get a breakfast through charitable sources, the clergyman, or the head-master or mistress of the school, may go to school in that condition.

2696. Have you in your parish ever started any system of charitable breakfasts?

Yes, regularly every winter. I feed on an average from 150 to 200 children on four mornings in the week, and give them dinner from the 1st of November to the 1st of May; for three or four of the five days in the week.

2697. Free breakfasts and free dinners?

The breakfasts are *almost* free, but for the dinners they pay a halfpenny, because I object to the system of pauperisation, and I discourage gratuitous relief except in sick cases.

2698. Do you think it would be possible to start a large system like that in each district in London?

Undoubtedly, and I would not allow the School Board in any way to touch it. I think it would be ruinous to the morale of the children, and to the teaching element too, that they should be allowed free dinners there. If in a parish of 11,000 Mrs. Adamson and I are able to carry out that system individually (because there is not another lady or gentleman living in the parish to help me), if I can do that along with my wife and workers, it is clear that a large representative system could accomplish greater results still.

2699. Then you do not think that the giving of these meals would tend to lessen the idea of responsibility on the part of the parents?

Not where there is payment; and that is why I would not allow the School Board to have it under them, and let it be done gratuitously; where you charge a small sum it makes a difference.

2700. You mentioned that you thought it would be a good thing to have a half-time system in the schools?

For the last year or two of their scholastic career.

2701. Does it not occur to you that the technical work done in the afternoon would be of rather a hard nature, and that a very good meal would be necessary in the middle of the day?

The medical faculty say it would be a very pleasant exchange after the mental work of the morning if the physical were brought into play in the afternoon; in that way there would be a balance between the physical and the mental; so that

that when they came to 18 and 21 years of age they would be fit to marry and to undertake the responsibilities of life and citizenship. I would even go further, and say, that if there was any hard manual labour in the afternoon these children should go to the places where the dinners were given, and on payment of a halfpenny have their dinner given to them, so that they might be sufficiently strong for any physical work they might have in the afternoon.

2702. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury*] Supposing an association, such as was alluded to in a former question, were formed for the receiving of work from the good employers, and distributing it to the workers, would it be practicable to carry that out?

In my humble judgment it would not, but I would not like to dogmatise upon it.

2703. And experiment might be tried to see whether it was practicable?

Yes; I think a year's experiment.

2704. May I ask why you say beforehand that it is impracticable?

I do not know that I could give a special reason, beyond just the impression derived from my knowledge of trade and business, and the ideas of the employers and the *employés*. It has been said of many of the Bills which your Lordships pass, that a coach-and-four could drive through them; and in the same way I think the employers would get through any association of that kind, and any rules.

2705. It would be impossible, of course, unless the employers were in favour of it, and willing to use such an association?

You would never get them to do it; it is the same thing in regard to the shutting of shops. In certain parts of London it is agreed by all the trades that they will shut at a certain hour; that goes on for a few weeks, and then one shop is kept open beyond that hour, and then another, and gradually the old state of things comes back again; and the same thing would apply to the employers; one would break through the rule, and then another would do it in self defence, and then the result would be that the whole system would vanish.

2706. It could only be possible, as I understand, if it could be made to serve the interests of the employers as well?

Yes.

2707. Is there any trade house at all that employs its own servants to distribute work, within your knowledge, instead of employing middlemen.

A good many do that. Workpeople from my parish go down straight to manufacturers in the City with the goods, without having anything to do with the middlemen and sweaters.

2708. The middlemen, of course, are a very large class?

A large class.

2709. But you would wish to do away with them, if you could; you would wish that all workpeople should be in immediate contact with the employers?

I wish that as a clergyman; I do not wish it otherwise, for the simple reason that I do not blame the system.

2710. You concede that middlemen are necessary; a necessary part of the whole fabric?

Yes.

2711. Then you complain of the unfitness of the girls when they leave school for any manual or domestic employment?

Yes.

2712. What would you do, so as to enable them to be fitted for such employment, if you had the girls to teach?

If you had them on the system I have suggested, of half-time for their last year or two at school, they would be qualified when they left school, even if it were at 14.

 2713. Where

2713. Where would they spend the afternoon; this half-time?
On the school premises.

2714. Learning the new kind of work; domestic and manual work?
Yes; such as there might be if a laundry were established. As a ratepayer, I would not at all object to the increased rate, with a view of having the premises enlarged, and buildings of that character erected, in order that a laundry, a wash-house, and so on, might be established.

2715. That is very hard work?
It would not be hard work there; it is hard work, but not in those places. They would merely learn a little, sufficient day after day to train them.

2716. But then it requires a great system of providing things which have to be taken to the laundry, things which are wanted?
Nothing greater than the present system of education.

2717. What is to be washed?
Of course you must have the clothing brought in for the washing.

2718. Their own?
I would not care whether it was their own or from outside.

2719. How would you keep the whole thing going?
By an extra staff.

2720. The laundry work, however, is only a small part of the whole?
Yes, I only mentioned that as an illustration; it is done with cooking already on a small scale. Your Grace is aware that the cooking system has been introduced into Board Schools at certain centres.

2721. May I ask you what the halfpenny dinner costs you?
The halfpenny dinner costs me three halfpence.

2722. Then it is a charitable gift?
Charitable gift.

2723. If the dinner were supplied as a part of the school system, how would you have that two-thirds of the whole cost made up; would you have it still a charitable contribution; could you trust to that, or would you come upon the rates?
I think a large organisation could accomplish it.

2724. A large charitable organisation?
Yes.

2725. And then you said that you objected to their having anything without paying for it; but do not you give them breakfasts without payment?
A farthing is paid. There are free cases, of course, both of dinners and breakfasts. I take, for instance, three or four children of one family; they could not afford to pay the amount, and therefore one child would pay, or two, and one or two would come in free; in that way there may be a free breakfast and also a free dinner.

2726. But that only diminishes the idea of pauperisation in degree; if a child only pays one-third, it is a recipient of charity?
Yes.

2727. Do you think that paying, although much less than it costs, is sufficient to avoid the idea of pauperisation?
Yes, it increases the self-respect; I have found it so.

2728. Earl of *Derby*.] Do you mean by that that the children are under a sort of mental illusion that they are paying for their dinner, or their breakfast, when they are only paying for a third of it?
Possibly; it is very likely; it is a pleasing delusion.

2729. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh*.] As to the seamstress work, these mantles and things that you spoke of, are they taken up by people whose regular occupation it is, or are there many instances of their being taken up only in times of distress?

Not

Not in the case of these better class goods, they are regular *employés*; but there are cases of inferior goods in which unskilled labour is taken up in time of distress, and then dropped after a time. Trousers making is an instance of it; that is very simple. Then children's slippers, that is also very simple. These will be taken up by a raw and unskilled hand for a time, and thrown aside again. A great deal of that kind of work is due to the fact that the men are out of employment, or that they are not paid sufficient to maintain their families. Another point in connection with this lies in the fact that many married women will go to factories, and unfortunately go for less than the single girls; why? Because their husbands are earning a little, and they can, therefore, put the two together; but the single girl is entirely dependent upon her wages, and she cannot take the wage which a married woman will accept. That is a cause of a good deal of mischief.

2730. She cannot compete with the woman who goes to work as an auxiliary to other sources of income?
No.

2731. Lord *Monkswell.*] Do you agree with what we have been told, that more direct communication is being established now between employers and employed, so that the sweater is being crushed out?
The middleman strictly; but there are sweaters over and above the middleman, and that is getting worse.

2732. I understand that every middleman comes under the definition of a sweater?
No; a sweatee may be also a sweater. I may be a sweatee of a sweater, and yet I may be sweating somebody else underneath me.

2733. Do you mean that the small sweaters are being gradually crushed out?
No, on the contrary, they are increasing.

2734. You say that the girls cannot scrub; do they not see domestic work at home?
No. Not far from my vicarage is a room where father and mother and six children live, one son being 16, and a daughter 14; what domestic work in the one room, where there is a father and mother and six children, could this daughter learn? It is impossible.

2735. If a girl learnt housework, would it be any advantage to her; is not the market for house work just as much crowded as for other kinds?
On the contrary, there is such a demand for servants that when I advertise a girl that I have, who wants to get into service, I have as many as 50 replies from ladies for one. Then, on the other hand, there is such a vast field for domestic servants in the Colonies, and that field is spreading every year. These girls could be emigrated to the farms; and now that there is a system on the part of the religious denominations by which we can send them out to families where we know that there will be no immorality.

2736. You talk of the great preponderance of females over males; are you aware that the births of males, for a good many years past, have very considerably predominated over the females?
I am not aware of that.

2737. That is so over the country, 21 to 20 being the proportion. No doubt after a certain age you do find that women predominate, because they live longer than men?
Yes; I beg your pardon, I thought that you were referring merely to the question of the births; I was referring to the existing population.

2738. No doubt there is a surplus of women; they live longer than the men?
Not only that they live longer, but that many boys will die off from starvation, and so on. We know perfectly well that a girl will live on food on which a boy cannot live; his frame requires greater nourishment; consumption is superinduced, and there is no natural increase. The result is that the boy will die more quickly than the girl.

2739. At what age do you take it that the girls begin to predominate over the boys in point of numbers?

I do not think I can give an opinion on the age, more especially since the School Board system has been introduced, for I think the School Board system has seriously altered the relationship there.

2740. *Chairman.*] Is it not your experience that girls much prefer the comparative independence of work to going out to domestic service?

I have many girls in my parish who, the moment Mrs. Adamson and I suggest to them service, take offence, and the result is that we never can put them right again. We are gradually learning now to leave them to themselves and not to suggest service; for it is not to my interest as a clergyman to suggest it, it gives such mortal offence.

2741. Then there would be no great object, would there, in educating them for it?

Yes, in many ways. The reason why they do not think of domestic service is, partly that the father and mother want to eke out their own little pittance by taking the children's. In mentioning remedies, I have not referred to that question; and in connection with your Lordship's question, I may observe that one of my remedies would be legislation of some kind or another, with a view to altering the existing state of things in regard to boys and girls in East London who are swarming, from 13 to 18 years of age, in absolute idleness, as well as taking work at small wages.

2742. It has been suggested to the Committee before that it would be advantageous if legislation was brought into force, the workshops to be registered and subjected to proper sanitary inspection, and in fact to discourage, if not to stop altogether, the work being done in people's own rooms; do you agree with that?

It would be very nice if it was possible. I do not like grandmotherly legislation.

2743. But what I want to get from you is what the effect would be upon your parish if people were not allowed to work in their own rooms?

I think it would add ten-fold to the poverty. Many women could never go to factories or large places who do work at home, so that such a measure would add to their poverty. But if you got rid of the surplus population of course wages would rise for the men and for the women who did go to the factories, and perhaps in that way the evil would be remedied.

2744. A great number of the women who work as trousers' finishers and shirt finishers, and so on, are obliged to work because their husbands are out of work?

Are out of work, or are lazy and will not work. I now refer very carefully (because I know these statements appear publicly) to a limited number, when I state that there are a limited number of men now, and I think that number is increasing each year, who claim support from their wives; and that the barbarous system of Africa and other countries is growing up amongst certain classes of our poor men, of making the wives do the work. There are cases which I have known where they have even made their wives engage in immoral practices in order that they might subsist. That exists in a very limited degree, but it does exist. I knew it more in Bethnal Green than I know it in my own parish where I am now working.

2745. Is it not a fact that there are a great many men quite anxious to get work who cannot get work?

A good many. There you come into the better class of working men, but in a number of the lower class of working men in East London there is neither the mind nor the body either to do the work or to care to do it.

2746. If you had this technical education which you propose, and fitted boys to do manual labour and so on, would not the result be merely to increase the competition for that kind of work?

No; I think it would lead many to go abroad to the colonies; and they would

would go to Canada, for instance, and enter on farms, or be employed in handicraft. When I consider the vast capabilities of these colonies, I am sure these lads and girls would not dislike emigration; but they dislike it at present, when they have got nothing that they can turn their hands to.

2747. Is there anything you would like to add?

I want to mention something in regard to remedies. I have mentioned, as one, the remodelling of the educational system. I now come to the question of early marriages; I hold that the marriage law as it at present stands is wrong, and whilst I think that the French law is one going to the extreme in one direction, I consider that we are in the extreme in the other direction, and that we ought to have legislation limiting marriage of men to the age of 21, and marriage of women to 18, and that men under 21 should not be allowed to get married. I know that this is a very hard thing, and might give great offence to many of the people when it is read, but that is the result of over 20 years' experience.

2748. Lord *Thring.*] Would you make the marriage void if they did it?

I would not allow it.

2749. Supposing a person did it without its being known, would you make the marriage void?

That is just a question for the Legislature; they might be punished; I do not know that I would make the marriage void.

2750. Earl of *Derby.*] You would put a penalty upon the man if he married?

I would rather leave that for the Legislature.

2751. Lord *Thring.*] When you say you would prohibit marriages, what sanction or penalty would you put upon the violation of that law; you must either make the marriage void, or punish the man or woman, or both; I want to know what you would do?

I should feel greatly obliged if your Lordship would not press the question. I feel a delicacy, as a clergyman, in giving my view as to the penalties or the means to be adopted, whether making the marriage void, or imprisonment, or fine. His Grace might help materially in it in regard to the early marriages if the clergy could be induced in any way to discourage them more than at present. There is great competition in regard to marriages.

2752. *Chairman.*] I understand then, as regards these marriages, that you think they ought to be prohibited, but that you decline to give an opinion as to the legislative means which ought to be adopted?

So far as legal prohibition is concerned; but in regard to moral influence, I have mentioned what I would suggest in that way to the Committee. One other point is in regard to the large number of boys and girls who are remaining idle when they leave school at 13, and get no employment; they are, therefore, a burden upon their parents, and their brothers and sisters who are in employment, and thereby, indirectly, they increase the evils of the sweating system; because the parents, or the brothers and sisters who are earning wages, are glad to take lower wages and to take in work in order to help to support these idle boys and girls. Therefore I think there wants some legislation, some means by which the boys and girls, who remain idle between 13 and 17 or 18, can be utilised. I am in favour of modified conscription of boys, who, if they have been 12 months away from school, and are out of work, should be taken by the authorities and placed in military and naval schools, and training homes, and utilised either for the Army or Navy, or other purposes. The evil of these boys between 13 and 17 or 18 is growing enormously, and many of them go ultimately to swell the criminal classes.

2753. You mean in the case of a boy who leaves school at 13, and with regard to whom it is found that at 14 he is not supporting himself, or that he is earning no wages at all?

That he is earning no wages; not in employment.

2754. You think, if he has got no employment at 14, the State ought to take him with or without his will?

At the age of 14 or 15, I think so.

2755. And train him and support him?

If the parents, of course, are well enough off to make them pay something, I see no reason why they should not be made to pay, just as children can be made by a board of guardians to pay so much for supporting their aged parents.

2756. Under your plan the State would have to support these children for four years before they could utilise them in any way?

Taxation is heavy, and I am quite ready to share in this, because I know the evil is so enormous, and is growing. Socialism and even revolution are linked with this particular question of the children between 13 and 18 years of age. Your Lordships know that a great many of those who appeared at the West End were raw youths; they were not men of strong build and mature age. Then, too, these boys being idle are a burden upon their parents generally, and in that way they help to keep wages down, and they encourage a system of severe sweating.

2757. Perhaps you are not aware that there is no difficulty whatever in getting recruits for the Army or Navy now, and if the State was to train up these children for the Army or Navy, what would you propose to do with those recruits who voluntarily go into the Army and Navy?

Is that the case my Lord? I understood from officers that it was a most difficult thing to get recruits at the present time; I know that only from hearsay, it is not within my own personal knowledge; of course I had in my mind training homes for colonial farm operations as well as naval and military homes.

2758. You think that the State ought to take the charge of these children if they do not succeed in getting work for themselves; do not you think that would discourage them from attempting to get any work for themselves?

No, I think not; it is done in a modified form now by Dr. Barnardo; he has hundreds of these boys at a time in his training homes, and then they are sent out fitted for work in the Colonies. Now if an individual can do it on a limited scale, why should it not be done with far greater results on an extensive and official scale. The last point that I want to mention to your Lordships is in regard to the foreigners, and the question of how to prevent foreigners coming. I object to *dilletante* philanthropy, and I also object to the socialism which says, "Forbid foreigners to come to this country, and shut them out." It is an absolute impossibility unless France, and Germany, and Russia, and the United States do the same; and then Englishmen and Scotchmen will be excluded from those countries. It is an absolutely impracticable suggestion to carry out. The alternative, it seems to me, is either a poll tax upon every foreigner; that he shall pay a poll tax every year in addition to the ordinary rates and taxes he may have to pay, or that he should be required to go back to his country unless he can show that he has sufficient means to maintain and establish himself without being a burden on the country, or affecting the material interests of the community.

2759. That would be the system applied in the United States?

As applied in the United States.

2760. It ought to be applied here, you think?

Yes, my own personal view is in favour of a poll tax in preference; because the money system would be liable to this danger, that a person coming with money would begin the sweating operations, having money enough, and therefore he would aggravate the evils of sweating in one way whilst we were preventing it in another. Therefore I am strongly in favour of a poll tax.

2761. How long would you impose this poll tax?

I do not know how long a person must be resident in England before he can become naturalised. I certainly am in favour of a poll tax for five or ten years,

years, and then of course they would become naturalised residents in this country.

2762. Earl of *Derby*.] Do I understand you that you would apply that poll tax to the case of an immigrant who came in with sufficient means to maintain himself?

I would apply it to every foreigner.

2763. In point of fact, though you object to an immigrant who comes in without funds, you object still more to an immigrant who comes in with funds?

No; it is because I do not see how you could make a distinction amongst foreigners, whether you could lay down that the individual who did not have 100 *l.* for instance, should pay a poll tax. I do not see where to divide, and therefore I say all.

2764. Earl of *Onslow*.] Would you make any difference according to the length of his stay in this country; if he landed in this country should he have to pay the poll tax, though he might be prepared to depart the following day?

No, merely as a resident in this country, not if he left the next day.

2765. What do you understand by the word "resident"?

Take the case of a foreigner who says distinctly on his landing, "I am going to remain in this country"; or if he says on landing, "I am going to stay for a short time with friends, six or twelve months' time," I should still call that residing.

2766. Would you follow him up by police supervision, or how would you ascertain these facts?

It would have to be worked somewhat as the Income Tax or Inland Revenue is worked. I see the difficulties, but where there are two sets of difficulties I take the smaller one; and the evils of the sweating system are so enormous that I think anything that can be done short of impracticable measures ought to be adopted. The evils are growing, not diminishing, and the poverty consequent upon it is also increasing.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

WOOLF SILVERMAN, is called in, and having been sworn; is Examined, as follows (*through an Interpreter*):

2767. *Chairman*.] WHAT country are you a native of?

I was born in Warsaw.

2768. What was your trade?

I was a tailor there.

2769. What is your trade now?

I am a presser now in London.

2770. What branch did you pursue in Warsaw?

I did all the branches of the trade.

2771. How long have you been in this country?

Nine years.

2772. What made you leave Warsaw?

I did not want to be a soldier.

2773. How much money did you bring away with you from home?

One hundred roubles (10 *l.*)

2774. Did you come straight to London?

Yes.

2775. By what route?
Through Germany to Hamburg, and then to London.

2776. How much money had you when you landed in London?
I cannot remember, it is such a long while ago now.

2777. Were you assisted to come over here by any society?
No.

2778. What induced you to come to London rather than to any other place?
Everyone said it was better in London; everyone comes here, so I came here.

2779. You were not invited over here by advertisements or anything of that kind?
I was not induced to come here by any advertisements, but I had a cousin in London; I wrote to him asking whether I should come, and he replied, "Yes."

2780. Is your cousin in the same trade?
My cousin is a tailor, a master tailor.

2781. What did you do after landing?
When I came to London I worked as a tailor with my cousin, and when the worked became slack I went to another place and became a presser.

2782. What did you earn at first, for the first six months?
I received one guinea a week when at work; those were my wages, but I was only paid as many days as I was at work.

2783. Was it pressing work?
Tailoring in all its branches.

2784. And what do you earn now?
I received 6 *s.* 6 *d.* a day when I am in work.

2785. What do you average during the year?
About 18 *s.* per week on the average. I cannot exactly say what the amount would be; I cannot reckon up so well, but I think it would be 18 *s.*

2786. Have you kept yourself all the time that you have been in London, or have you had any assistance from any society?
I have received no charity from any place.

2787. Are you married?
Yes.

2788. What family have you?
I have got four children.

2789. Have you anything that you wish to state about the trade?
I go in at half-past six in the morning and leave off work at 11 at night. I went to work yesterday morning at half-past six and left off at half-past two the following morning, with one hour interval for dinner; no tea time.

2790. Are you earning better wages now, or worse than you could four or five years ago?
It was better four or five years ago; I earned better wages then.

2791. How many hours did you work at home?
I worked for myself when I was in Warsaw; I did not work for any employer.

2792. I want to know whether you work harder here or worked harder there?
I work much harder here than I did in Warsaw.

2793. Do you earn more money or less money than you did then?
I earn much less by working harder here than I did by working much easier in Warsaw.

2794. Have you ever thought of going back again?
I should like to go back, but I am so greatly distressed that I cannot go back.

back. I have four children depending on me, and I have not any means of going back, though I should like to do so.

2795. You earn, you say, an average of 18 *s.* a week the year all round; what do you pay for rent?
I pay 4 *s.* a week for one room.

2796. Do you know many of your countrymen who have come over to this country during the nine years you have been here?
From my own native place I know of 20.

2797. Do you know of any more who have come from the country generally?
I could not answer that; I could not say how many.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

ISAAC LEVY, is called in, and having been sworn; is Examined, as follows (*partly through an Interpreter*):

2798. *Chairman.*] Do you understand the language that the last witness spoke?
Yes.

2799. Did you hear what he said?
Yes.

2800. Are you engaged in the same trade?
Yes.

2801. You are a presser?
No, I am a machiner.

2802. What country do you come from?
From Poland.

2803. The same neighbourhood?
No, not the same.

2804. Have you anything you wish to say?
Yes. I am a machiner; I earn 5 *s.* a day, and have got to work from eight o'clock in the morning till eleven o'clock at night.

2805. Do you mean that you are earning 5 *s.* a day now, or 5 *s.* a day all the year round?
Not all the year round. A day that I work I earn 5*s.*, but not all the year round. At 10 o'clock in the morning they give us a cup of coffee for breakfast; at a quarter past 2 we go down to dinner; and at 3 o'clock we have to be back. At 8 o'clock we get a cup of tea, and at 11 o'clock we leave off. I should say that the workshop is very small; there are nine men and three females that have to be in that room to work; six gas-lights, and one coke fire, and one watercloset for the whole house. We have got to work very hard for our living; my hands got like this through my work (*exhibiting his hands*). The basters and pressers work from 7 o'clock in the morning till 12 o'clock at night, in the very same workshop; they are in a different branch of the trade, not in the machine-work, but basters and pressers.

2806. How long have you been in this country?
Seven years.

2807. Did you bring any money with you when you came?
None at all.

2808. What did you come for?
My father had been here three years before; he came backwards and forwards, and he sent me here to learn the trade. He had been here three

 years,

years, when the trade was better than it is now, so he came home and sent me to England.

2809. What were you before you came here?
I was at school.

2810. What can you earn on an average all the year round?
That is what I could not say; sometimes I can earn 10 *s.* a week, and sometimes I cannot earn anything; many weeks I can hardly keep soul and body together.

2811. What do you do during the time you have no work to do; do you go to the shop; do you still have to go to the place you work in?
Yes, I have to go; I must go and enquire.

2812. What work do the women do?
That is on button-holing.

2813. How long do they work?
They work from eight till eight, but when they leave off they take the work home, and they do the work at home.

2814. They work 12 hours, you mean, in the shop?
Yes, but as a rule, when they leave off they take something to do at home.

2815. You have an hour for your dinner?
Three-quarters of an hour.

2816. Do you go out for your dinner?
Yes.

2817. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] How long had your father been over here before you came?
Three years before I came.

2818. Lord *Monkswell.*] You did not come to escape the conscription?
No.

2819. *Chairman.*] Have you had any assistance from any society over here?
No, I only had some assistance at the German Hospital when I had my hand done up; from the Board of Guardians I had 4 *s.* during the three months.

2820. How did the injury to your hand come?
From the hard working. A fortnight ago I had to leave off.

2821. Is it common to have a swelling from working so long with the machine?
Yes.

2822. It is a common thing to get that swelling?
Yes.

2823. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Have you seen other machinists with their hands swelling?
Yes, I have come across them.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

BARNETT COHEN, is called in, and having been sworn; is Examined, as follows (*through an Interpreter*):

2824. *Chairman.*] WHAT is your trade?
A machiner.

2825. How long have you been here?
Nine years.

2826. What country do you come from?
From Russia.

2827. What

2827. What was your trade in Russia?
I was a landlord in my own country; I had property of my own.

2828. What induced you to come over here?
I was a soldier three years, and I ran away from it.

2829. How did you come to England, by what route?
I came through Germany to Hamburgh and London.

2830. Did you come straight to England?
Yes.

2831. Did you have any money with you?
No.

2832. Then perhaps you will describe to us how you learnt your trade?
I had a nice suit of clothes, though I had no money; I pledged that suit and obtained half-a-sovereign, and I gave that half-a-sovereign to the sweater who taught me the machine work. I had very little to eat, half-a-quartern loaf and a herring for my meals during the time I was apprenticed to the sweater.

2833. How long was that?
Four weeks for nothing, besides the half-a-sovereign; and after the four weeks he gave me 6 *s.* a week.

2834. And what do you earn now?
Seven shillings a day, but I never make a day; I work three-quarters, quarter, and half days.

2835. I want to know, not what your nominal wages are, but how much you earn?
We are busy for six or seven weeks; I can make during that four days' work at 7 *s.* per day; during the remaining part of the year I can make three-quarters of a day per week; one day, half a day; and a quarter of a day sometimes.

2836. Are you working piecework?
No, day-work.

2837. And how long have you to work when you do work?
I come up to work at 6 o'clock, and work from 6 o'clock until 9 at night; that is a day's work.

2838. What is half a day's work?
From 6 o'clock till 1 o'clock; three-quarters of a day's work is from 6 o'clock till half-past 5. Then they provide me with coffee, but I have to drink that coffee while I am working. The coffee is cold; they do not bring it up when it is hot but when it is cold, so that you may not lose much time in drinking it.

2839. Have you got a wife and family?
I have got a wife and four children.

2840. And you have always been a machinist?
Since I have been in London.

2841. You do not know any other branch of the trade?
No, I know nothing about the other branches of the trade.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

FANNY EISENBERGER, is called in, and having been sworn; is Examined, as follows (*through an Interpreter*):

2842. *Chairman.*] WHAT is your business?
Tailoress.

2843. What branch of the tailoring trade?
Hand-sewing.

2844. Where do you come from?
Hungary.

2845. Why did you come here?
My aunt came to London and brought me with her; my aunt has left me in London alone, and gone to America.

2846. Do you work at home or for a master?
I work for a master.

2847. How many people are there in the shop?
Seven altogether, three females and four males.

2848. And what do you earn per week?
When I am at work, I earn 5 *s.* per week.

2849. How long are you at work?
About four weeks during the year I can earn 5 *s.* a week.

2850. And what can you earn during the time when work is slack?
Two shillings and 1 *s.* 6 *d.* per week.

2851. How long hours do you work?
From seven in the morning till half-past eight at night.

2852. Have you anything that you wish to say?
I am treated badly by my employer. The workshop is a very small one; there are four gaslights in the same shop.

2853. Do you complain of that on account of its being unhealthy?
Yes, I am very ill through the smallness of the workshop and the number of gaslights. However hard I work the employer drives me still on; he says, "You do not know enough"; and when they bring us up tea or coffee he does not give us any time to drink it, but we must drink it immediately; and he shouts and holloas at the hands.

2854. Do you live with friends in London?
I live with a countrywoman of mine; I sleep with a countrywoman.

2855. And pay her so much rental?
I pay her 1 *s.* a week; my countrywoman trusts me at times when I cannot pay, and when I have better times I pay it off. I receive small sums from friends at home; I should like to go back, but as I am in such a destitute condition I cannot. I had no work throughout the winter, so they sent me 30 *s.*, and now I have written for some more money, but my father is dead, and I do not expect to get any more.

2856. Have you had any aid from any charitable societies since you have been here?
No, from nobody.

2857. Earl of *Onslow.*] When you and your friends communicate with friends in your own country, do you advise them to come to this country, or do you advise them not to come, because trade is bad?

I write

I write home that it is very bad; I have not any money to live with. My mother wrote to me that she is trying to get some money, and she might send me some over to come back again. I have got nothing else to say, but that I should like some assistance to go home, or else some work.

2858. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] What was your father?
He was an honest orthodox Jew; he was a sort of literary person.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Martis, 8° *Maii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of CANTERBURY.
Earl of DERBY.
Earl of ONSLOW.
Viscount GORDON (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord CLINTON.
Lord CLIFFORD OF CHUDLEIGH.
Lord KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord ROTHSCHILD.
Lord MONKSWELL.
Lord THRING.

LORD KENRY (EARL OF DUNRAVEN AND MOUNT-EARL), IN THE CHAIR.

MR. WILLIAM PARNELL, is called in, and having been sworn; is Examined, as follows:

2859. *Chairman.*] You are the Secretary of a Trade Association, are you not?

I am Secretary of the West End Branch of the Alliance Cabinet-makers' Association.

2860. Are you yourself a cabinet-maker?

Yes, a journeyman cabinet-maker.

2861. How long have you been in the trade?

I was bound apprentice when I was 14 years old; that was in 1864. I have been in London since 1872. I have been secretary of that branch, I think, since 1879.

2862. Do you understand at all what is usually meant by the expression "the sweating system"?

What is usually meant by the sweating system I think does not at all convey the correct idea of what sweating really is. The sweating seems to convey an idea to the generality of the public that it only exists where such bad wages are earned, that the individual who is sweated can scarcely live upon them; but in our opinion (I am speaking for my fellow-workmen) that is not the idea which we have of sweating. We consider sweating to be the taking out of any undue profit from work that would otherwise go, or that could otherwise be applied, to the labour put in that work. As an illustration of what I mean, I will say that if a firm gets an order to supply furniture to a customer, and the firm which gets that order does not itself manufacture the furniture, but gives it out to a sub-contractor, that is the first step in sweating. When these steps go from one to two, three, four, or five degrees, it is quite evident, and every man will admit, that that is sweating; but I think that the first step is as much sweating as the last. The real effect of it is to reduce both the quality of the article and the wages of the workman. I know of a case in which work has been obtained by a large firm and given out to a sub-contractor, who has given it out to another sub-contractor, who has given it out again to a man supposed to be his foreman, and the foreman has then given it out as piece-work to the workmen. I will leave your Lordships to judge whether, if that had been made by the firm who obtained the order, the customer would not have received a better article, and also whether the man who made it would not have received better wages.

 2863. Do

2803. Do you include upholstering in your evidence?

I know nothing of upholstering; I am speaking merely of cabinet-making. What we complain of is that in each of these transactions, this downward scale, each firm whose hands it passes through takes particular care to make sure of its own profit. For instance, if I were a firm who was dealing with a customer, and getting an order, I should make sure of so much per cent. out of that order as profit; the next one who gets that order makes sure of the same thing, and so the third, and so the fourth. But the workman has no remedy; he has unfortunately the option of either taking the work for the amount offered by the employer under whom he may be working, or of going out into the street to search for work elsewhere; and, unfortunately at present there is as much surplus labour, that it is Hobson's Choice entirely, and that the man has to take it or go. If a man refused to take it his place would be filled in about five minutes by some one else, who would be pleased to take it. The effect of this system has been that you can scarcely order a single article of furniture from any firm in London and make sure that it will be manufactured by them; and where I take it that the great evil is, is here, that the customer who obtains the article from the firm he gave the order to, is in the majority of the cases distinctly told that it is their own manufacture. I am speaking now of my own personal knowledge. I have been more than once sent to customers' houses to look at, and, if possible, alter or repair articles of furniture that have been supposed to be manufactured at the factory at which I worked, when it has been one of the most barefaced falsehoods any one could utter. In one particular instance I was sent to look at a cabinet. The customer paid 24 *l* for that cabinet; it was a small china cabinet, and there was not a single portion of the work that could by any stretch of the magination be called good. It was presumably a black walnut cabinet. The article was made principally of deal, and where seen it was veneered. The doors were made of deal and veneered on both sides, instead of being made of solid black walnut, or of mahogany and veneer. There was nothing that fitted, and there was nothing to keep the dust out from valuable china. That article was lined with crimson plush, and if you stood it at the other end of the room it was calculated to deceive an inexperienced person. It was in such a condition, and the lady got at me in such a manner, that I was obliged at last to throw on one side the instructions that I had received from the firm, that I was to declare that it was made in the factory, and I had to tell her that I had never seen it before, although at that time I had been two-and-a-half years in the factory. It was in such a condition that I could not repair it; I could do nothing to it at all; and I came back and reported what I had done; that I had told the customer it was not made on the premises, and that it was in such a condition that it could not be repaired possibly without coming to the factory and being thoroughly reconstructed. It came back to the factory, and the sub-contractor who made it was brought to the factory, and he took it away. What became of it afterwards I do not know. That has happened to me in several cases. It not only applies to one firm, but other firms as well; cases have come under my notice through being secretary of the branch of the society, in which other firms have sent men on the same conditions. One firm in particular, a West End firm, an old established firm, one that a few years ago you could depend upon having a thoroughly good article from if you desired it (I cannot call this exactly sweating; it is not so in my own mind), have a factory in the country. You would not think it would be necessary for them to deceive their customers as to where the article is made, but they do. A customer gives an order there, and this order, instead of being executed in London, is executed in the country at their country factory; but when it comes from the country factory men have been instructed to see that no sign of any packing whatever is left inside or outside of any of the goods, for the very reason that the customer is to believe that it was manufactured at the London factory. Of course their reason for having it manufactured in the country is that in the country wages are not so high, and that good work can be turned out cheaper. Of course I do not consider that to be sweating if, wherever they do it, it is their own manufacture; and I really cannot see why they should be afraid to tell the customer it was made at their own factory in the

the country. The noble Lord sitting on your right, last time did not see anything wrong in sub-contracting. I think that the employers see something wrong in it, otherwise they would not be at such trouble and pains to make men tell lies to take people in. They would not certainly order a man to declare that this or that was made in their own factory if they did not think it wrong that the customer should know that it was not made there. One result of this system has been that a six-foot wardrobe, which in 1874 I received 7*l.* 8*s.* 6*d.* for making, is now made, or at least has been made, for 4*l.* 10*s.* 6*d.*, the man in both instances having to do the whole of the work by hand. The prices for making various other articles of furniture have been reduced in similar proportions. I know, that although in 1874 I was working in a trade workshop, or as I prefer to call it, a sweating shop, and although working for a firm whose work is sent to the customers direct, yet I have to work 30 per cent. harder to earn the same amount of money that I did then. Of course all that I know about particular cases of sweating that have not come under my own knowledge has been brought to me by members of the society. In some instances they have come on in strike, and their evidence has been taken before us, and according to whether we believed or disbelieved them, so they have been granted strike support. Those large firms that do not manufacture anything at all are, we believe, the cause of those other large firms and good firms which formerly manufactured their own goods having been brought down to adopt the system of sub-contracting or sweating. The men are certainly not free from blame in the matter. The facilities that have been offered by dealers in furniture, rather than manufacturers of it, for men to become, as it were, their own masters, have been greedily snatched at by men, who think they are going to better their position by getting into business themselves and supplying those firms with cheap and inferior goods, but unfortunately it has generally happened for them that their prosperity has led them to come back to the bench again; and those who have had to do that all agree that the system is entirely wrong, and that a thorough exposure of it ought to take place. It is principally for that reason that I have appeared here, in answer to your Lordships' request, to give evidence before you. As an instance of the manner in which prices have been gradually brought down, I might say that since Christmas Messrs. Maple have began to manufacture for themselves. I do not know whether they did, slightly, before Christmas or not, but since Christmas they have begun to manufacture much more than they did before, but the wages earned there are very bad indeed. Two cases have come under my own knowledge in the way I told your Lordship before. One man, far above an average workman, a man who was able to earn, I think it was 10*d.* an hour, something like four years ago, when he was working for Messrs. Stephens and Dore, who then supplied Maples with goods, worked at Messrs. Maples since last Christmas, for nine days, and he earned the magnificent sum of 40*s.*; of course he turned the job up. Another man, also a good workman, worked the same time, in the same factory, nine days for 30*s.*, the 30*s.* being an average of 6*d.* an hour instead of 9*d.*; the firm that he was working for before, the sub-contracting firm, were always in the habit of manufacturing first-class articles, and from those first-class articles that man was enabled to earn, at day work, at the rate of 1*d.* an hour over and above the recognised society wages of the trade; and when working for the firm that was supplied by these sub-contractors, he was only able to earn 2*l.* by working nine days. Mr. Burnett in his report does not consider that the middle-man is a sweater. I do not understand why he does not, because, in my estimation, the middleman is the sweater, he is the man who causes other people to sweat; and those people who are in the habit of sub-contracting, letting off all their responsibilities respecting manufacturing, and securing a profit without any risk whatever, I call sweaters of sweaters. They are, in my estimation, the very essence and the very cause of the sweating. If it were not for these people the trade would have gone on in a similar way to that in which it did before; more manufacturers would have employed their workmen; the work would then have been made of a good quality of wood, and the man would have received something like a fair share of the profit for his labour; whereas now, a firm like Messrs. Gillow, for instance,

 will

will receive an order, and it will probably be made in some sub-contractor's shop. If Messrs. Gillow made it themselves they would have a large stock of dry seasoned timber to fall back on to manufacture the article from. The sub-contractor, more than probably, has not anything like a stock at all; the wood is brought direct from the timber yard, and used at once. I think your Lordships, knowing something about what wood is, when it is in an unseasoned state, will know what happens to the furniture in a very short time. The consequence is that, go where we will, they tell us that English cabinet-makers have deteriorated in quality, that they cannot possibly manufacture the same quality article that they did 50 years ago. But that is not the case; they do not give us the chance; there are as good mechanics in the cabinet trade now as ever; and if your Lordships would put us to the test, and order something like what was ordered 50 years ago, and not be particular to have an estimate before it was made, but to have it made for a fair price, you can get as good an article as you could 50 years ago. That will bring me to another cause of this sub-contracting and sweating; the demand by the general public for estimates for everything. It is almost a matter of impossibility to turn out a good article if you are bound to an estimate, because there is such great competition, that the lowest estimate is almost necessarily bound to obtain it, and the consequence is that the article and the workmen suffer. The remedy for this, to a great extent, I think, is the extension of the Factory and Workshop Acts. I will give you my reason for thinking that, by my personal experience in the East End of London since this inquiry has been on foot.

2864. Where do you mean by the East End of London?

Bethnal Green and Curtain-road. I have taken the trouble to walk round about Bethnal Green, where some of these garret masters' dens are, late at night, after I have done my own day's work. I find that they work on a Friday night there until half past 11 o'clock, which is the latest hour I was able to stop, having to catch a train to get back to my home, and I found (it was not here and there, but almost everywhere) they were at work. I found in one place three women and two men at work at half-past 11 on two Friday nights. They were making the common gipsy tables, that is the small round table with three spindle legs. The women were doing the polishing; the men were jointing the top, glueing the two pieces of wood together necessary to make the width of the top. Last Friday night the women were sitting down having their supper, and the room in which they were working was about nine or ten feet square; there were two paraffin lamps burning in it, and, as I said, three women and two men who worked at it, and also there were two or three people who were looking on at that time. In another place, I saw a man and three boys, each of these boys was under 16 years of age, making a common mahogany chest of drawers. Now the ordinary way in which we put chests of drawers together is, that we dove-tail one piece of wood into the other; but there was no dove-tailing in this; only what we call Birmingham dove-tails, that is, nails; they are all nailed together; the ends are made of wood about half an inch thick, rather under than over; it is called in the trade half-inch stuff, but it only makes up to three-eighths; the other portion of it was put together, and the nails driven in, and then veneered over; that man was employing three boys at half-past nine at night.

2865. Earl of *Onslow*.] Of what age?

Neither of them was 16. Another place was an upholsterers. There were two men, and one boy about 14. At a place out near Bethnal Green Junction Station there was a large factory capable of holding, I should think, 60 or 70 men, at ten o clock at night in full swing. I do not think I need run through any more of them.

2866. *Chairman*.] Were there any women or boys in that factory?

I could not see. They came down to see what we wanted, and we had to clear out of it, in order not to get ourselves in trouble. These things are what I have seen in walking from the City-road to Bethnal Green Junction, and almost at every step, certainly in every street, there were cases of that kind going on. And Mr. Arnold White told you last week how these people sold their goods, and

and the profits and losses they made on them. I should call your Lordships' attention to one other case, and that is a man who had been in business for some years manufacturing sideboards. There was not a piece of the wood that these sideboards were represented to be made of. For instance, he was making a walnut one and an oak one while we were there. The two extreme ends of the sideboard were of half-inch walnut and half-inch oak; all the other wood in it that was of walnut or oak was only three-sixteenths of an inch thick. They were, of course, of the worst description of furniture you could imagine, but, when finished, were of sufficient appearance to deceive a good many people as to their quality. That man told me that he worked from eight in the morning till half-past eleven at night all the week through. He had two boys, his own sons, working under him, one about 17 and the other between 18 and 19, I should think, and a man. By working this extraordinary number of hours he was able, at the end of the week, to secure the magnificent sum of 19 *s* for his week's labour. The men working under him got considerably more than that, because if he worked 60 hours he would get 25 *s.*, which is 5 *d.* an hour. The employer told me he would have been perfectly satisfied could he have made 25 *s.* for the week. He sold his sideboards for 2 *l.* 5 *s.* a piece. Of course he would not tell me where. I think I have said sufficient for your Lordships to understand why I say that the extension of the Factory and Workshop Acts would be beneficial. I would make it compulsory that every place where work was done should be registered as a workshop; and what I would call a workshop would be where one man was employed, not simply where two or three were employed together, because we see such cases of endeavouring to evade the law, that if you were to make it mean where three people were to be employed, they would put up partitions, so that each man should work in a separate room. I would make it that every place where work was done, whether it was a man's home, or whether it was a place hired for the purpose, should be registered and inspected. Of course we know perfectly well that the present number of factory inspectors cannot possibly do what they have to do, and, therefore, it would mean a very great increase in the number of factory inspectors; but I think that that is a difficulty which we in England, a rich country like this, ought to get over.

2867. Earl of *Onslow.*] You say you would call it a workshop where one man was employed; do you mean by that, employed by some one else, not employed on his own account?

I meant to say where one man is at work. I take it that if I like to turn my bedroom into a workshop and work there by myself, the factory inspector has as much right to come in and see that I am doing nothing likely to injure the health of my neighbours, as he has if I employ 40 men in a factory. Another thing which I believe would be a remedy, is shortening of the hours of labour. We find now that although in the generality of shops men are supposed to work only nine hours a day, that is frequently evaded when there is actually no necessity for it. The men, of course, want as much money as they can possibly get on a Saturday or at the end of the week, and they are always willing to work overtime. I would make it an offence for anyone to work overtime while there was room in the shop for other people to be employed. And here I should like to say this, I do not mean to think for a moment that we can abolish all overtime. Sometimes it is absolutely necessary that a man should work an hour or two later, but I mean this, that if a man works overtime one day he should stop it out of his next day's work if possible, or at all events, that by shortening the hours of labour to an actual nine he should only work 54 hours for his week; and if such a case should arise that working overtime was necessary, it should be worked in the same way as the publicans work overtime now, they apply for an extra license. Now, I am going to talk of a rather more personal matter. Something cropped up here last week in reference to Messrs. Maple's firm?

2868. *Chairman.*] You say it is rather a personal matter; is it a matter that has any bearing upon the trade generally?

Yes, I think it has; at all events, in our opinion it is one bearing on the trade generally.

generally. When I say a personal matter, I mean simply as regards one particular firm.

2869, You understand that the Committee are sitting to inquire into what is commonly called the sweating system, its causes and effects, and that, therefore, it is desirable that you should, as far as possible, give evidence having that point in view?

I quite understand that; and though I used the word "personal," I did not mean to say that I had any animus at all against Messrs. Maple; until, I think, last Tuesday, I never saw Mr. Maple in my life; but it is the system that we all know exists in that firm in reference to our trade which has been, in our opinion, the chief cause of the great extension of the sweating system.

2870. Do you mean that a different system exists there from what is customary?

I would not say that; but I know more of that system in that firm than as it exists in others; but I believe it exists in others, in fact, I am pretty well sure of it. If it were confined to Messrs. Maple's firm, I think there would be not such difficulty in our getting rid of it; but, unfortunately, it has so permeated the trade, that you can scarcely say where it exists and where it does not exist.

2871. What is the system you object to?

The system I object to is the system of a reduction of the price after the price has been agreed to. I had occasion to investigate the matter some little time ago, and I found that every person who had dealt with Maple said distinctly that they always had to submit to a reduction when they took the work home. That is all I wish to say about it. Of course this has come to me second-handed, and I shall endeavour, if possible, to bring the people who told me so to tell your Lordships the same.

2872. I understand you to mean that, having contracted to do the work for a certain price, when they bring it in to deliver it, they are obliged to take a lesser price?

Yes.

2873. Lord *Monkswell.*] That you do not know of your own knowledge?

Only by investigating the matter.

2874. Lord *Thring.*] How does that bear on the sweating system?

It tends to reduce the wages.

2875. But I understood you to define the sweating system as the employment of commission agents and the subdivision of labour. How is the fact that, rightly or wrongly, a particular employer deducts a certain sum, connected with the sweating system as you have defined it?

If it were not through the sweating system these people would not have to supply the furniture to Messrs. Maple or others, and they would not then be liable to have a reduction demanded from them.

2876. But the sweating system is carried on by many employers who do not make this reduction, I presume?

No doubt.

2877. Then how does the fact of a particular firm making that reduction bear on the sweating system?

By making it worse. Because if a man agrees to make an article for a certain price, and then cannot get that price, the price of it is so much reduced that it enables that particular firm which adopts these practices, to sell cheaper than their neighbours; therefore their neighbours require to have theirs brought down.

2878. Are there not, in your opinion, many firms, or some firms, who, though they do not sweat, make a reduction?

I never heard of it.

2879. Earl of *Onslow.*] But is it not the practice throughout the large concerns in the furniture trade to deduct a sum of money for payment in cash instead

instead of, as used to be the custom in former days, a deferred payment of three months?

I could not say that it is, or that it is not.

2880. But are not all those who deal with Messrs. Maple and these other large firms perfectly well aware, before they undertake the contract, that if they are paid in cash the discount will be deducted?

As I understand it, they do not know what deduction is likely to be taken from them, and if they knew it was a deduction of 2½, or 5, or 10 per cent., they could allow for that.

2881. Do they ever ask before they take a job what deduction will be made for payment in cash?

That I could not say.

2882. *Chairman.*] You mean to say that the deduction is not uniform?

Yes.

2883. Lord *Thring.*] Do you know that of your own knowledge that there is no uniform rule of deduction?

No, not from my own knowledge, but from evidence which I have gathered.

2884. The evidence you have gathered shows that they deduct capriciously, and not according to a uniform rule?

Yes.

2885. Lord *Monkswell.*] Have you had a reduction made in your own case?

I have only been journeyman. When I have had to repeat a job I have had to make it sometimes for less.

2886. *Chairman.*] You mean that when a man understood that a reduction of 5 per cent. was to be taken off on account of payment in cash, possibly he might have 10 per cent. or more taken off?

Just so.

2887. Earl of *Derby.*] You speak of a reduction in payment after the price has been agreed on?

Yes.

2888. But if agreement has taken place, is not the subsequent reduction a fraud which the law could deal with?

Unfortunately very few written agreements take place.

2889. Lord *Thring.*] But why is not a verbal agreement valid in that case?

The difficulty would be, I think, to get witnesses. Besides, your Lordships will understand the difference of position between those who attempt to make a reduction, and those who have to submit to it. If a man is waiting for his workmen to be paid, so that they may buy their food for the next day, and the next week, he cannot haggle about terms, he must accept them, or go without his money.

2890. The deduction is always made in a particular case by Messrs. Maple?

I do not know about always.

2891. But very generally?

Very generally.

2892. But a man who has been working with Maple for a year or two, do you think he does not know after a year or six months' experience that when a particular price is named, it means that a different price will be given in cash?

I think he probably would know it meant a different price, but not how much the difference would be.

2893. And that you will prove?

I hope to prove it.

2894. Earl of *Derby.*] Do you mean if he were to say, let me know what I shall receive in cash, they would not tell him?

I do not know; I think it is very likely they would not.

2895. I think you said something about the workmen not having any choice as regards bargains which he might consider unfair with an employer, because there is so much surplus labour that he is not a free agent; that is the way you put it?
Yes.

2896. Does it not really come to this, that, in your view, no contract between the employer and the employed in this kind of business is a really free contract?
Yes, that is my opinion.

2897. Then, following that out, does it not come to this: that, in your opinion, the relation of contract does not exist between those two parties?
It exists in so far that it is binding upon the workman; but the freedom of making the contract is all on one side; the workmen's necessities are played upon.

2898. Then your argument comes to this, that somebody, somehow, ought to interfere to prevent the workman from entering into contracts which are really not free on his part?
It does amount to that; and the way in which I think it could be brought about is by placing the surplus labour in employment by the reduction of the hours.

2899. I was coming to that; you wish to make it an offence to work overtime; that is to say, to work more than 54 hours a week?
Yes, or whatever might be the number of hours.

2900. Do you think those workmen who are in good employment and who are working more than 54 hours a week, and who are making a good thing of it, would readily consent to any regulation of that kind?
Probably not; but I take it that the liberty of the subject is the freedom to do that which shall not injure his neighbour; and I maintain that a man who is working, fully employed and getting good wages, is injuring his neighbour who is not fully employed and is getting nothing..

2901. That is to say, that there being a certain amount of labour required in the market, if a man works more than nine hours he is taking more than his share, and taking away somebody else's share; that is your argument?
It is.

2902. But then suppose the surplus of labour over the demand to be considerable, why do you draw the line at nine hours; would it not equally follow from your argument that if there is only enough work to give six hours all round men ought to be limited to six hours?
Yes, quite so.

2903. And do you accept that result?
Yes; if there were only sufficient to give a man four hours, I would accept that result.

2904. That is to say, you think that no man should be allowed to work for more than that number of hours which, being divided among the whole number of workmen unemployed, would form the average?
I do.

2905. And you would apply that, not only to persons who are working for employers, but to those who are working for themselves?
As far as possible.

2906. And you say that the homes of workmen who are working for themselves ought to be registered and inspected in the same manner as factories?
Not the homes; the rooms in which they work.

2907. Even if those rooms are part of their homes?
Yes, if they are part of their homes.

2908. Do

2908. Do you agree with a witness who appeared here on a former day, who would forbid anyone working except in a registered factory or workshop?
Yes; I think that all workshops or factories should be registered.

2909. But we had it stated here, that there is a strong desire on the part of the working men that no work in private houses should be allowed; that it should all be carried on in registered factories or workshops; would you concur in that?
I do not think I could go so far as that; private houses would practically, under my suggestion, become registered workshops.

2910. Earl of *Onslow*.] About the question of the deduction; do you know what the practice in the trade was some years ago as to the time when they made these payments; was the payment on the delivery of the goods, or was it postponed?
I really could not say. My impression is that it always has been paid on the delivery of goods in the great majority of cases, and I come to that conclusion in this way: that the majority of the people who work under those conditions are not in a position to allow payments to stand over.

2911. You do not know then whether there has been a change in the practice of the trade?
I think not.

2912. *Chairman*.] You had not finished your statement, had you?
I have very little remaining, I think. The only other thing is in reference to the registration of workshops. I should like to say that I do not agree with Mr. Arnold White in reference to charging a fee for registration. I think there are many small employers who employ one or two men, where this fee would snuff them out. Where they are really legitimate employers; that is, where they work directly for customers, I do not think it would be the way to better the trade, to snuff them out; but I would insist on a very heavy fine for non-registration.

2913. Have you anything more you would like to say before we ask you some questions?
I think I have gone pretty well through the points which I intended my statement to deal with.

2914. There are two technical points I should be glad if you could clear up for me; you spoke about a black walnut cabinet, and you stated that it was very thinly veneered on deal?
Yes.

2915. I want to know what is understood by a black walnut cabinet in the trade; it is not understood to be made of solid black walnut, is it?
According to the price that is paid for it, I presume the customer would estimate it; that customer had paid a price for a good article.

2916. But "a black walnut cabinet"; what is understood in the trade by that?
By a black walnut cabinet we should understand a cabinet principally made of solid black walnut wood; we certainly do not understand that the doors would be made of deal and veneered on both sides.

2917. What would they be made of?
Most probably of solid black walnut. That would be a cheaper way of making it than to be made of mahogany and veneered on both sides, because mahogany is really more expensive than black walnut. When we speak of a black walnut cabinet we mean one that is made principally of solid black walnut, American walnut; of course we do not understand by that that the whole of the job is made of black walnut. For instance, the top and bottom of the cabinet would be of pine, the back would be most likely of pine, unless ordered otherwise, certainly for a covering with plush.

2918. You spoke about a garret master; will you describe what you mean by a garret master?

A garret master is one who works for himself in the East End of London, and supplies goods to dealers either in the Curtain-road or the West End of London. That man that made the sideboards is termed a garret master. They work as long as they feel disposed, and they buy all the material necessary to manufacture the article on which they are employed, and then they take it out on the hawk to sell it, that is, they take it out to dealers, first to one and then to another, until they manage to dispose of it at some price or other. They generally, indeed very often, dispose of it for almost the cost price of the material, just a trifle over and sometimes even a trifle under.

2919. They do not make the goods on orders received, but make them and try and sell them, as I understand you?

Yes. Of course some of them may eventually get orders by disposing of an article to a broker's shop.

2920. How many men and women and children are these men accustomed to employ?

That I could not say, they vary so much. This man had two sons of his own and a man. That other man making the drawers had three boys working under him. The people where the three women and the two men were at work I believe to be in one family; it is generally worked by the family. I think, in the great majority of instances, it would be a man and his son, and perhaps his wife helping him, particularly in the small toilet-glass making. In this common toilet-glass making you find the whole family employed, even down to the little children assisting in glass-papering the wood.

2921. Do you think a great many of the articles made in these places find their way eventually to the large houses in the West End?

Many of them.

2922. And how many hands do they pass through?

They probably pass through three hands in getting to the West End; sometimes they go direct.

2923. You spoke of large firms manufacturing nothing; are there many firms to which that remark applies?

Many.

2924. What firms; would that be true of a firm like Gillow, for instance?

Gillow manufacture part of what they sell. Messrs. Maple have commenced to manufacture a part. Many of those firms that sell in Tottenham Court-road do not keep a single cabinet-maker at work, except for repairing and going out to fit up the work that they sell. I think there is no firm in existence that manufactures the whole of the furniture they sell.

2925. There are firms in existence that manufacture none, you say?

Yes, many.

2926. You spoke about the change that had taken place in the trade lately?

Yes.

2927. And you said that in former days it was carried on by firms who, as I understood you, constructed all the articles on their own premises by their own workmen. When did this change take place?

The change has been so gradual that I really could not tell you when it took place.

2928. When you speak of former times, about what time do you mean?

Over 20 years ago.

2929. And since then the change has been gradual?

It has been gradual. I think one reason which I stated just now has partly been the cause of the gradual change, and that was, workmen being too anxious to better their position by working for trade buyers instead of working for people who supply customers direct.

2930. In

2930. In other words, by competition on the part of the workmen themselves?
Yes, by competition on the part of the workmen themselves.

2931. Has foreign competition come into play at all?
It has come into play, but I do not think to any serious extent, so as to bring us down to the level at which we are now.

2932. You do not consider that that affects the trade?
It does affect the trade.

2933. But not materially?
Not to any material extent. We have an enormous number of foreigners working in the trade, but the competition from them is not more keen than English competition.

2934. What are some foreigners, Jews?
Germans and French and Jews as well; the Jews are principally at the East End.

2935. Is the tendency in the trade generally towards minute sub-division of the work?
Yes.

2936. I mean that one man formerly completed an article which is now done by a number of men?
A man usually completes an article now; in these shops they take so much for the job, all the work; but the sub-division comes in here, that where a man formerly could make any article of furniture required, now he usually in these shops only makes one article, year after year, time after time; he makes a chair, or a table, or a washstand and table (they generally go together), or a hatstand, and could not make anything else. I think one great cause of that has been the almost total abolition of the apprenticeship system. There is scarcely a legally bound apprentice in London now at the present moment. Boys go to the shops as errand boys, to sweep up the shavings and run errands for the man, and in a little while, as they get bigger and stronger they get a jack plane put into their hands, and they assist that man on any particular job he may be working on, and so they pick up a knowledge of the trade, and they can only make one article, and a very inferior article, when they get turned on to the market themselves.

2937. You spoke also about the competition in the country, that work is sent down into the country to be done; and you spoke about as good an article being made in the country and made cheaper than in London?
Yes.

2938. Have you any objection to that?
Not when it is done by a firm who have a factory in the country of their own; but there is as much sweating done in the country as there is in London. In one of the west of England towns, Barnstaple, for instance, there is a great deal of it done; there is a large factory there that has no connection (when I say "No," I believe it has none at all) with any private customers whatever; they send the whole of their production to the London market, or nearly the whole of it, to supply the dealers.

2939. Lord *Clinton.*] What trade is that in?
Cabinet-makers. They send the furniture that they manufacture to the dealers in London.

2940. *Chairman.*] What do you mean by "dealers"?
The large shops such as Maple, Shoolbred, Hewetson and Thexton, Oetzmann, &c.

2941. When you spoke of the advantages which you think might be derived from limiting the hours of labour, I suppose you meant to extend that all over the country?
Yes; it would be useless else.

2942. How many members are there in your society?
The whole of the cabinet-makers' societies in London number something under 1,000 members, against 33,000, as Mr. Burnett stated as the number of cabinet-makers in London.

2943. You have only 1,000 out of 33,000 belonging to any trade association?
Less than 1,000.

2944. When you spoke of "society wages," what did you mean?
Wages generally recognised by the societies (there are five distinct societies in London), that is, 9 *d.* per hour.

2945. How is that rate struck?
It was struck in 1872 or 1873; in 1872, I think. There was an agitation then for an advance of 10 per cent. in prices of piece-work, and 1 *d.* per hour rise in the day-work wages. It was raised from 8 *d.* to 9 *d.* without a strike, and the 10 per cent. was granted on the piece-work as well; but since that 10 per cent. has been granted, the reduction in the price really paid for the work, through disorganisation, the men not being able to maintain the prices, has been so great that, as I stated before, we have to work now 30 per cent. harder to earn the wages we could earn in 1873.

2946. How do you account for the fact of apparently so few men belonging to those five associations?
One reason by which I account for it is that we have been so few in number that our contributions have been obliged to be so heavy to meet our liabilities that some men have not been able to afford it. Another reason is that some men earn so little money per week that they say they cannot afford it; and the principal reason is general apathy of the workmen.

2947. Have you anything to say about the sanitary condition of these garret-masters' workshops or other workshops?
In the garret-masters' workshops there are certainly no sanitary arrangements at all. When I spoke of the case in which a man, two boys, and a workman were making these sideboards, the room had evidently not been whitewashed for years; it was as black as a man's hat.

2948. I understood you to say that to your knowledge women and boys under 16 years of age were employed?
And girls.

2949. Working illegal hours?
Working hours that would be illegal if they were under the Factory Act.

2950. And in fact the chief cause, as I gather from you, of the evils in the trade that you complain of is competition among the workmen themselves?
One of the causes; not the chief. I think the chief cause is the sub-contracting.

2951. But does not that result from the other?
A good many of these men have gone in as garret-masters; they do not come under sub-contracting, because they very rarely get orders, though it has a tendency to bring down the price of the contracting.

2952. You mentioned at the commencent of your evidence a case, I think, where there had been three or four sub-contractors; is that beginning from an order from one of these large firms?
Beginning from an order from a customer to one of the large firms.

2953. Given out by the large firms to somedody else working in their employ?
Yes.

2954. And given out by him to somebody else, and so on?
Yes.

2955. Two or three men intervening?
Four intervening; first the large firm, then the sub-contracting firm, then another

another sub-contracting firm, then the foreman of the last-named, and then the workman; five altogether.

2956. And is that, in your opinion, at all a common thing?
Frequently; I could mention other cases where it happens three or four times.

2957. Lord *Thring*.] I understand you object to a cabinet-maker wishing to better himself?
No.

2958. I understand you to say that a skilled workman ought not to produce more work, or work more hours, than a man who is not equally skilled?
A skilled workman does not require to work so long as an unskilled one.

2959. But suppose he wishes to work longer, and therefore makes more money; you object to that?
Certainly; because he is doing an injury to a fellow man.

2960. According to that, if I work harder than you I do an injury to you?
No; if a man has the ability to work harder there is no reason why he should not.

2961. Then I misunderstood you altogether; I understood you to say that you object altogether to one man in the cabinet trade working harder and earning more money than another man?
No; I object to a man working longer hours.

2962. You do not object, if he can do more work in a less number of hours, to his doing it?
I do not see that objection would be any good.

2963. Supposing you can do as much in one hour as I can do in five hours, you would not object to our working an equal number of hours, though you would do five times as much as I should?
You are putting a case that is an impossibility.

2964. I will take a less extreme case and say, as a matter of fact, a good workman could do as much in one hour as a bad workman could do in two hours, therefore he would do in the same number of hours double as much as the other man; do you object to A. doing double as much as B., in the same number of hours?
If I happened to be B. I should object to it very strongly, if I were in the same shop with A.; but I do not see that in theory we could object to one man working harder or earning more money than another. What I objected to was a man attempting to better himself by entering into what I consider to be unfair competition with another man. If I, as a journeyman cabinet-maker, wish to better myself by getting legitimate trade from customers, I do not see that I should be doing any injury to others; but if I wish to do it by cutting the throat of some other trade-working employer, I am doing a great evil.

2965. I understood you to say that, supposing that there was a certain quantity of labour to be performed, you thought the hours ought to be reduced from eight to six, or to any number necessary, so that each man might have an equal quantity of the labour?
An equal chance of labour.

2966. But then supposing one man could do double as much as the other, you do not object to that; but that would have exactly the same effect?
I do not see that any objection to that would be any good, because you could not compel a man not to work to the uttermost of his strength. That, of course, takes place now under the present system, and that has the result, with the working a longer number of hours, of throwing a certain number of people out of employment. If we so reduced the number of hours all round, that the work would put these people into employment, the fact of a man still working harder than his neighbour would not alter the result, because he does so now, the

result is that there are so many men out of work. It is a purely theoretical point, I think.

2967. Then with respect to the "apathy" of the workmen, do you not think that that may be attributed to the fact that Englishmen like to have their own way, and earn as much money as they can, without being interfered with by other people?

It may be so; but I generally find that a trade society has put no serious restriction on anybody.

2968-9. I thought you told Lord Derby that you did wish to have most serious restrictions put on; that the hours of labour should be diminished till the whole work was divided among the whole body of workmen?

Not through the trade societies, but by law.

2970. That is stronger still. You wish, as I understand it, a law to be made that when there is a certain quantity of labour, and a certain quantity of men, that labour should be equally distributed?

Yes.

2971. How would you ascertain the quantity of labour, and the quantity of men, amongst whom it was to be distributed?

Somewhat in this way; we find at present, by taking the returns of the Trade Unions, that since 1874 there has not been one single trade that has been represented at the Trades Union Congress that has been fully employed throughout one particular year. We have gone on gradually from bad to worse. There are more people out of employment; I do not say that there is less work; there is more work being done now in England than ever there was before, but I do say that the normal position is, that every trade has a certain number of men over and above the amount of employment that, under the present number of hours, is available for them.

2972. But then I understand that you wish to restrict this number of hours by law?

Yes.

2973. And yet you do not call that a serious restriction?

I understood you to mean that you thought the reason why men did not join trade societies was, the restriction of the trade societies upon them; and in answer to that, I said I have not found that the restrictions of the trade societies were very severe.

2974. But supposing you had this severe law which you have proposed, would it be pleasing to those many workmen who wish to work as many hours as they like?

If it were not pleasing it would only be just.

2975. Why just?

Because every man has a right to live. If I am doing a double number of hours, and my neighbour is doing none at all, I am not acting just to him.

2976. I thought you said if you were much more skilful than I were, you do not wish to prevent your skill producing a good deal more produce than my deficient skill could produce?

But if I, being skilful, am working 12 hours a day, and you working none at all, and I am by law bound to reduce my 12 hours to 8, I necessarily provide you with something over four hours' work, you being less skilful.

2977. You say it is extremely wrong that manufacturers should have goods which are not made in their own workshops. But supposing I do not; supposing I give you a certain job to do, and guarantee your goods to the public as being exactly the same as I make myself, and I know them to be the same, what is the difference?

I should like to ask, my Lord, how you are going to know they are the same?

2978. I understand you to say that anybody of sufficient knowledge, by examining the goods, could tell whether they were equally well made?

They

They could tell whether they were equally well made, but they could not tell what the material was while the thing was new. The same thing would apply to what was stated here in reference to the shoemaking trade, where a firm in the East End of London, I think it was, said that the workmanship was guaranteed, when they knew nothing at all as to either the quality of the leather that was put into it, or where the work was done. It is just the same in the cabinet trade.

2979. But is it possible that a skilled person cannot tell the quality of the leather in shoes?
They could tell, doubtless, to a great extent; but you see it does not pay them to tell.

2980. But if I get goods manufactured by you, and I take the trouble to examine them properly, and guarantee them under my name as being equally good as those manufactured by myself, whom do I wrong?
You wrong both your customer and your workpeople.

2981. Why?
Because the intermediate man has to get a profit.

2982. You do not wrong the customer?
Yes; he pays more than he would do if you manufactured it yourself, providing the work is the same quality.

2983. Why does he pay more?
Because he has to provide for the sub-contractor's profit.

2984. That is the profit that I, the manufacturer, make?
No; the sub-contractor has a profit.

2985. But the customer is only injured by the fact that he pays more?
In that case; but that case, I am sorry to say, very seldom happens.

2986 Earl of *Onslow.*] Your principal grievance is that by reason of this cheaper reanufacture, and by reason of the sweating system, the wages of the cabinet-makers have, in some cases, been reduced from 9 *d.* to 6 *d.* per hour?
In some cases to very much less than that.

2987. What is the lowest?
The lowest I have come across has been 3 *d.*

2988. But those cases are very exceptional?
No.

2989. Threepence an hour, working 10 hours a day, would be 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a day?
Yes.

2990. And do you consider that a starvation wage?
I should for a mechanic who has to provide 20 *l.* worth of tools, and serve a seven years' apprenticeship.

2991. You know in an agricultural district 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a day is considered a fair wage?
Yes; and I know also that 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a day in an agricultural district will go as far as 10 *s.* a day in London.

2992. You had a grievance, I think, against the purchasers of furniture because they in so many cases now-a-days wish to have an estimate first of all?
Yes.

2993. But is it not the concern entirely of the purchaser whether he sees that there is a proper specification for the work which he wishes to have estimated for?
I do not object to a specification.

2994. But may not the specification include the work which is to be done upon the goods, and the manner of the work?
It seldom does.

2995. But it is his own look out if he gets bad work done for a cheap rate?
To a great extent it is his own look out, because he could insert a clause to guarantee the quality of the work; but that is very rarely done.

2996. I understood you to say that you wished the extension of the Factories Act to some of these workshops in which young boys under 16 are employed?
Yes.

2997. But is it not the case that those workshops would come under the Factory Act now?
They do not; they should do, of course.

2998. I ask you whether you are aware, as a fact of law, that in every workshop in which young persons under 18 are employed, they come within the scope of the Factory Act?
Yes, I am aware of that.

2999. Then is it not rather this: that you complain that the factory inspector does not visit them, rather than that they do not come under the Factory Act?
They are not registered, the majority of them, and I do not see how the factory inspector is to find them out.

3000. But is there any provision now for registering workshops?
I could not say.

3001. I suppose you know the opinion of most of the members of the society of which you are secretary?
I think so.

3002. Do you think that they would agree with you as to the desirability of shortening the hours of labour?
I not only think that they would, but they have done so.

3003. And is it the general opinion of the working men with whom you come in contact?
There are differences of opinion on the matter, and there certainly are indications that the generality of them are in favour of reducing the hours of labour.

3004. You think that if such a proposition were made in Parliament, it would receive the almost universal support of working men; is that so?
That I could not say; working men are such funny cattle to deal with.

3005. Earl of *Derby*.] You told us just now that whereas formerly an artizan was in the habit of making a variety of articles, he is now generally confined to the making of a single article, and does not know how to make others?
Very frequently.

3006. As a consequence of perpetually going through the same process, is he not more expeditious and more skilful in doing that piece of work?
More expeditious; he has not time to be more skilful; he has not time to do the work properly.

3007. But whether it be that the work is done quicker or that it is done better, production is more effective when each man does confine himself to the making of a single article; is not that so?
More effective by turning out a greater quantity, it must be so.

3008. And as a consequence of turning out a greater quantity, it is turned out more cheaply?
Yes.

3009. And I presume that a considerable proportion of the articles made in the trade which you are referring to are articles used by the poorer classes?
No; the articles I am referring to are not used by the poorer classes; they are used by the middle class and retired tradesmen, up to the highest.

3010. At any rate, they are used by classes to whom the difference between 7 *l.* and 4 *l.* may be material; is not that so?
Possibly so in some cases.

3011. I did

3011. I did not quite understand how you propose to get rid of middle-men and sub-contractors; that I understand to be your principal object?

Yes; that was one point I intended to have spoken of in my statement, but it slipped my memory. I should suggest that the Merchandise Marks Act should be enforced as much in trades at home as it is in imported goods; that if a tradesman makes a false description of goods, he should be liable to a penalty for fraud. For instance, if I have an order from a customer to manufacture an article of furniture, and I give it to some one else to do, yet I tell that customer that I made it, or that it was made on my own premises, that I should be liable to prosecution for fraud.

3012. You would not allow a master to put his name or stamp upon an article as guaranteeing it, unless it be made upon his own premises?

I do not understand that a name of a firm simply means that they guarantee the article. If we find the name of a man on an article of furniture, it gives the public the impression that it was made by that manufacturer.

3013. Then would you compel the maker who might be working on his own account to put his name and mark upon it?

It would be so, in my opinion; but the question of compelling it is a difficult one.

3014. Now, in reference to your proposals as to limitation of hours of labour, I take it that they come to this: that if two men want work, and there is only work for one, the one who has got the work is bound to do only half a day's work, in order that the other may have the other half?

It would come to that eventually, no doubt.

3015. Under that system, supposing it to be adopted, do not you think that the articles produced would become more expensive?

It might possibly so be; but if taken in connection with the abolition of the sweating system, it would not be more expensive to the customer.

3016. Then, perhaps, I need not ask you whether you desire to limit foreign importation, if you found that these restrictions increased the cost of articles produced at home?

I do not think those restrictions would increase the cost; and, as regards restricting the importation of foreign labour, I have no wish to do it.

3017. Lord *Clinton*.] You spoke of the sweating system in the cabinet trade being extended to the country?

It exists in the country; I do not know whether it has extended to it.

3018. And you mentioned Barnstaple?

Yes.

3019. Were you speaking of your own knowledge?

I am a Devonshire man. I do not know Barnstaple; but I know the dealings of some of the Barnstaple firms.

3020. Is that under the sub-contract system you spoke of?

Yes, generally.

3021. In the cabinet trade in Barnstaple?

Yes.

3022. You said that some years ago, in 1873, I think it was, you could earn 7 *l.* 8 *s.* 6 *d.*, by making a 6-foot wardrobe?

Yes.

3023. And now only 4 *l.* 10 *s.*?

Yes, 4 *l.* 10 *s.* 6 *d.*

3024. Do you know the selling price of the article at those different dates?

No, I could not say.

3025. You do not know whether the one is cheaper than the other?

No.

3026. As to an estimate, you object to a customer asking the price of an article before he orders it?

I think the noble Lord has somewhat misunderstood my objection. If I have a sketch made of an article of furniture I require, and give it to a responsible firm, I should have a right to ask what they would make it for; but if they give me a fair price, I do not think it is right of a customer to insist on a reduction. I am working on a job now, when I am in the shop, where a fair estimate (in which I, and many others, estimated for the labour) was put on according to the wood. I know the whole of the transactions from bottom to top; and while the material was estimated for fairly, and the ordinary profit of the firm was added to the estimate of cost, the customer required the job to be carried out to specifications, and yet thought that the estimate was very high indeed. You could not knock anything off the material; the firm would not knock anything off from the profit; and the consequence was that the difference had to come out of the labour. That is generally what it results in, the cutting down of labour.

3027. And the manufacturer gets a lower profit?

No; the workman is the one out of whom it comes.

3028. If a customer says, "I must have it at a reduction of price," you say it comes off the labour?

Yes, in the great majority of the cases; and the consequence is a man must live, and in order to live, he must scamp his work.

3029. Lord *Sandhurst.*] You say that under 1,000 belong to the association in your trade?

Yes.

3030. Do these other men belong to any other union?

No.

3031. Is that partly because of disinclination on the part of employers to employ men who belong to a union?

I do not think so; they do not find any difficulty in getting a job.

3032. Lord *Monkswell.*] One question about middlemen. You say that the middleman raises the price to the buyer; why do you suppose the manufacturer employs a middleman; does he not employ a middleman for his own benefit?

To avoid risk, I think; to avoid the chance of loss.

3033. Why should he raise the price to the buyer because he employs a man to his own benefit?

I think it does raise the price, because if it is possible for a man to sub-let a job three times over, and then for the workman to get about two-thirds of what he would do if he was working properly, I think it must necessarily follow that if he were able to earn the other one-third, it would not amount to the great difference that the intermediate profits do.

3034. In fact you think that the manufacturers do not know how to look after their own interests?

I think they do, only too well, and that they look after them to the detriment of the working community, and also the customers.

3035. The manufacturer gets more customers if he gets the article done as cheaply as possible?

Yes. If the manufacturer made the goods on his own premises he would still be able to supply them to a customer cheap.

3036. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] You mentioned one case where a man was working with four or five children; is that kind of thing very common in the cabinet trade?

Amongst the garret-masters I should say it was very common.

3037. And I suppose they never join any association?

No.

3038. And

3038. And they would probably object to any restrictions?
Most likely.

3039. How would you propose to prevent a man working overtime at his own house, with his own family?
By sufficient inspection.

3040. The people would be always there, and unless the inspector were there constantly he would not be able to tell how long they were working?
It would be a difficult thing to do; but if we had more efficient factory inspection we should find the evil very much less.

3041. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] Will you tell us the commercial strength of the trades union to which you belong?
About 600 in number.

3042. Has that union taken any steps towards removing some of the difficulties to which you have referred?
We have at times endeavoured to do so, but the majority of the outside men being so very great, of course we have been almost powerless in the matter.

3043. By outside men you mean men not belonging to the union?
Not belonging to any union; they number about 33 to 1. I might inform your Lordship that without any strikes we succeeded in getting, from 1865 to 1872, two 10 per cent. advances, though we were in such a minority; and, generally speaking, in the old system of working we have maintained that; but of course this sub-contracting has blown it to the winds as far as the general trade is concerned, like it has in every other trade. The nine hours is simply gone; it does not exist.

3044. *Chairman.*] Have you succeeded in keeping up the society rate of wages?
Only partially.

3045. You have had to reduce them?
We have had to reduce them in some instances; we do not recognise it if we can possibly avoid it.

3046. You said just now that you did not object to the importation of foreign goods?
Yes.

3047. Is there much competition in your trade from the importation of foreign goods?
I think we have a fair amount of it.

3048. Where do they come from?
France, Belgium, and Germany.

3049. Do any come from America?
Yes.

3050. Not in large quantities?
Yes; there is a firm in Limehouse that deals in nothing else but American furniture. I think a great deal of it was sent to the West End only last Friday.

3051. Do you not anticipate that anything that would increase the cost of production here would throw the trade into the hands of the Americans?
I do not anticipate it would increase the cost of production, always understanding that this sub-contracting is done away with.

3052. Lord *Rothschild.*] Do you say that some of the sub-contractors pay higher wages than Messrs. Maple?
Some of them do.

3053. Earl of *Onslow.*] You would not have any objection to a man working 17 hours at Calais, and making a table there, to compete with a man working nine hours at Dover?
We hope to bring the foreigners to a better opinion.

 3054. You

3054. You do not think that the result of restricting labour would be to drive the trade abroad?

I think not.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. FREDERICK CHARLES BAUM, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

3055. *Chairman.*] Are you in the cabinet-making trade?

No, I am an upholsterer and secretary of the London Society of Upholsterers. I wish your Lordships to understand that there is a complete distinction between the trade of a cabinet-maker and that of an upholsterer. An upholsterer may be said to divide with a cabinet-maker the whole of the interior furnishing of a house, the upholsterer doing all the soft work and the cabinet-maker doing all the wood work; that was the old division of the trade. During recent years an entire change has taken place, and instead of the one general term "upholsterer" describing the trade at the present time as it was taught 50 years ago to apprentices, it is now divided among carpet planners, jobbing hands or fixturers, stuffers, cutters, undertakers, paper-hangers, mattrass makers, and floor-cloth layers, all of which are now separate trades, some of them having their own small trade societies. That has made a great change in the trade during the last 50 years. The upholstery work itself I would describe as being in three classes. The best class is that which is done by the firms themselves on their own premises; the second class which is done for firms by middlemen, or, as we know them, piece-masters; and the third class which is done at Wycombe and Bethnal Green, and the East-end of London for working men's homes, comprising common chairs, sold at 2 *s.* 6 *d.*, all ready stuffed, and 8 *s.* 6 *d.* chairs; that is the lowest class of trade, and that is done by men in their own homes. For the purpose of this inquiry too, I made a comparison between the Post Office Directory 25 years ago, and to-day as to the state of the trade, and I find that in 1862 there were in the Post Office Directory 446 firms described as upholsterers; in the last year there is only one more, 447, notwithstanding the vast increase in population; and of that number of firms, during the 25 years, only 82 firms have existed the whole period, or one in five of them. Of that number, 55 are small men, men who simply work for one or two families, and do the house work, that is to say, lay the carpets and repair the furniture from time to time, leaving about 27 firms only in the general sense of the term, which manufacture at all, which have existed for 25 years. In 1862, there were employed in the West Central District (I had to take one Postal district because it was difficult to ascertain it all over London so long ago), 91 firms who did not employ any workmen at all in my particular trade. There were 83 firms who employed 420 men, and 84 boys, or an average of five men to each shop. At the the present time, in the same district, there are 81 firms who do not employ, and there are 69 firms only who employ between them 219 men, 63 boys, and 47 improvers, so that there is a decrease in the number of workmen employed of something like 200 men in the same district But side by side there have grown up two large drapery firms (they were originally drapers), just outside the same districts, in Tottenham Court-road, who now employ between them something like 160 men, some 50 boys, and about 60 improvers; and in 1862, these two firms only employed something like seven men between them. These two firms are Messrs. Shoolbred, and Messrs. Maples. The firm of Shoolbred have always borne a high character among the workmen in the trade as paying "fair" prices, and being remarkable for their treatment of their workmen. I have been in the trade some 23 years, and am the son of an upholsterer. I am unable to say the same of the other firm, during the same period of time. In our trade, sweating as compared with the tailors and shoemakers, does not exist at present, but I am anxious to show you that in this trade, the inception or the commencement of a sweating system

system can be traced; that is, that you can trace here the growth of the germ which will degenerate into the same system as there is in the East-end. The system adopted by the large firm which I have said we have most reason to complain is this: This firm deal enormously with the piece-masters, that is to say, men who employ many boys to labour for them. They (Maples) may be said to be the backbone of these middlemen in the upholstery trade, as they are much the largest buyers of them, and have encouraged them to carry on their various shops by the large orders they give them, and they use them (the piece-masters) as a lever to reduce the prices they pay their workmen. Till within the last two years they used to pay the men piece-work, and whenever a man objected to the price which was offered him for the work, he was told: "You must do this considerably lower, because the piece-master sends in the work at a particular price which will not permit us to pay you this particular wage." And we complain that they have been the principal people in keeping these piece-masters going; they have placed them in unfair competition with the workmen by putting them against their own employés. I have found it impossible to tabulate the number of men and boys employed by these piece-masters; but generally speaking the custom is for one workman to be employed who is paid good wages, and a number of improvers who are paid poor wages, and then for some half-dozen or more boys to be employed to carry on the work. The result of that is that to enable the boys to do the work, the work is sub-divided into various sections, and that the last section anyone practically can do; porters or men with no skill at all are taken on to do the finishing part of the work and to do the ordinary part of it; and your Lordships will see that if you divide the work in that particular fashion it will be quite easy to bring over the Chinaman, whom Mr. Arnold White is afraid of, to do this easy work which is done by unskilled labour. I may say that in my particular trade we have no foreign competition. It has not been found possible to utilise machinery at all, and any reduction which there has been in our wages has simply arisen from the organised system of placing one man against the other. The particular system on the premises of Messrs. Maple, and which we would describe as sweating, is a system by which a workman who is working the whole week at a wage, it may be, of two guineas, or whatever it may be, should, at the end of the week, the work he has done not be of the value of his wages, does not receive the wages for the whole time that he has worked; that is to say, supposing a man has worked six days, he may receive the wages for four days only. It is common for men to drop one day, half-a-day, or a day-and-a-half; but I have known cases where the men have dropped three days of their time. This happens more particularly in what is known as the leather floor.

3056. Lord *Thring.*] What do you mean by saying that they drop days?

That the man drops his time; does not receive his pay for the time that he is there.

3057. Willingly, do you mean?

If he does not do it he will have to leave; he has to choose between losing that time and going. A man may choose to lose three days' pay rather than go.

3058. *Chairman.*] I understand you to say that a man working not piece-work, but task-work, is not paid for the whole time that he works?

That is exactly the case; that is the principle we find fault with in that system; and that, we allege, is distinctly sweating.

3059. How are these men paid, so much a day, or week?

So much a week, and they calculate the time at so much per hour; and doing a chair of this kind, the value of it may be alleged to be 2 *s.* 6 *d.* for the upholstery work, and for a man receiving 9 *d.* an hour, that would be a matter of three hours, or three-and-a-half hours.

3060. Lord *Thring.*] You must explain that a little more, please?

A man is paid at the rate say of 9 *d* an hour, and he has a chair like this to stuff, and the price that is allowed for that would be 3 *s.*

3061. *Chairman.* How do you mean, the price allowed for it?
Allowed for his portion of the work; to stuff this chair; the upholstering of it.

3062. Lord *Rothschild.*] The calculation being that, it would take a man three-and-a-half hours to stuff that chair?
Yes.

3063. *Chairman.*] Do you mean that he is paid at the rate of 9 *d.* an hour, 3 *s.* for stuffing the chair?
Three shillings for stuffing the chair.

3064. Piecework?
No; it is not piecework, although that is the system on which it is calculated; he gets a weekly wage of say, 36 *s.*, so that they estimate 9 *d.* per hour, 3 *s.* being allowed for that represents four hours of his time. If by any mischance the wrong covering is given to it, or something is done that he is not able to do it in the three hours (it is not necessary that there should be fault of his own), he does not receive the pay for the additional hour that that chair would take him to do.

3065. I understand you then that the man is paid at so much an hour, based on a calculation as to the length of time it will take to do a certain amount of work?
I would hardly say that; but a calculation is made as to the value of the work for a particular chair; they translate that to mean so many hours of his time at the rate of wages he is paid. If by any means (no fault of his own necessarily), it may take him longer than the hours they have estimated the work for him to take, he does not receive the pay for the additional time the work has taken.

3066. Lord *Monkswell.*] Suppose it takes him a shorter time, does he not get the advantage of that?
Not by any means. This is the advantage of it; we should have no occasion to find fault if it were so.

3067. Lord *Rothschild.*] Might it not be rather put in this way: supposing the firm considers him a bad workman, they deprive him of part of his wages?
Yes; but I will put the case stronger than that. I will mention a case which has created a feeling in the trade in the same firm. An order was given by Her Majesty, I believe, for a couch and lounge; it was repeated on the firm; a second was to be made like it, and by some fault or other of the salesman, the instruction was not conveyed to the workman how the second one was to be done, and he did it on a plan which he used to do, and which turned out to be wrong when finished. This was no fault of the workman's. When the job was finished he was told it was wrong. The man had to alter his work completely and lost three days' time on that particular job. Those three days' alteration he was not paid for, and that is a system which we allege is distinctly sweating, men not being paid for the time that they are employed on the work. They have a large number of apprentices who do part of the work. A man who had to finish the apprentices' work is not allowed for any alteration he may have to do in the apprentices' work; he is simply paid for the part he does.

3068. Earl of *Onslow.*] What became of the couch?
It was done as it ought to have been done.

3069. Did the firm confiscate the couch without paying anything to the man who made it?
They confiscated the man's labour of alteration.

3070. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] But did the firm allege that it was the fault of the workman?
They never alleged to the workman that it was his fault. This dropping of time is known more particularly in what is known as the leather floor.

3071. *Chairman.*] What is the leather floor?
Where the leather work is done. Messrs. Maple's leather work would equal any

any work done in any upholstery shop in London, the work is of a most beautiful character, and is certainly equal to any I have ever seen in any shop in London; and yet, strange to say, that those workmen are the worse treated of the whole of them with regard to the prices they pay, and a comparison between the men's time during the last winter and the time they were paid for would show a remarkable discrepancy, and which I explain to your Lordships in that particular way. They have a large number of apprentices there who are bound for five years. The lads are a good class of lad, fairly well educated, and generally the sons of small tradesmen, and who are bound for five years, and receive a good wage, rising from 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a week in the first year to a 1 *l.* in the last. During that period they are kept working in sections, learning a part of the trade; they do not become the allround professional upholsterer whom I described in the early part of my evidence; they are simply turned out as stuffers, in the result, in the end of their apprenticeship; and my experience as secretary of the trade society shows that for three or four years these men have to go about from shop to shop picking up a little here and a little there, practically finishing the learning of their trade. That, together with the large influx of men which that system is bringing into the trade, causes our trade to experience this serious change, which we feel that a man's years of labour are fewer now than they were 50 years ago. In every shop men are hanging about, that is to say, for days they have to stand still waiting for something to come in which they can earn a week's money upon; that happens in every shop, more so in the old-fashioned West End upholsterers; they feel it, perhaps, more keenly than others; and we have been much struck by the fact that firms which have been noted, and deservedly noted, for the good class of their work, the thorough genuine honest work which they themselves do, seem to have been the most serious sufferers in this change which has come over the trade. Fifty years ago it was common to pay 100 *l.* to apprentice a lad to the upholstery trade. Mr Arnold White described to you in his opening statement the sudden change there was in the upholstery trade about 1851 to 1853. Old-fashioned upholstery work was simply plain work, and but few buttons came in; but in 1851 a number of Germans from Vienna introduced spring stuffing and buttoning, as it is called (that pretty tufted work where there is a rise in the material; buttoning, we know that as), a spring in the seat, which have made such a change in the character of upholstery work. They were introduced by Germans, a number of whom came over to London and created a terror among our workmen that they were going to be flooded by them, but they have practically disappeared; at the present time there are hardly any Germans in London, there are a number of foreigners, but very few Germans at all in our trade. The skill required in our trade has undoubtedly increased since about 1868; the work has grown of a prettier character, and a more skilful character; and yet at the same time the rise in wages which you would have expected from more skill being required, has not taken place in the same period. Your Lordships may be aware that often in going to purchase furniture you are told that it is stuffed with hair. I want to show your Lordships what a general term that is. I have some horsehair here at 6½ *d.* a pound, which is about the cheapest that is used; and I have some at 1 *s.* 6 *d.*, which is the ordinary horsehair that is used in West-end goods. Both are hair; but you can get horsehair at 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a pound. You see what a vast difference there is in the goods described as "hair."

3072. What is the difference in the quality?

The 6½ *d.* hair is nearly all fibre, the other is genuine horsehair.

3073. You mean the 6½ *d.* hair is really not hair?

It is really not hair; there is just enough colouring to call it hair. If you press it in your hand there is a difference in the touch, and the result is seen in the furniture. The furniture stuffed with the common hair goes flat and wears into holes, whereas the furniture which is stuffed with horsehair has a spring and elasticity in it which prevents it from getting flat. Therefore furniture stuffed with that would last 12 or 20 years, while that which is stuffed with common material is gone in a week or two, or even in less; all the advantage of it, I mean,

is lost. That common material is that which is used by the middlemen, the piece-masters, almost invariably; and the customer, we allege, is defrauded when goods are supplied him by the middleman when they are represented as being done by the firm, because the firm cannot guarantee what they are supplying. We are acquainted with cases in which Messrs. Maple, whose name I have mentioned, have refused to deal with firms who have supplied them with goods, and who have deceived them in the quality of the material they have used, and they must sometimes be deceived in the matter; it is impossible for them always to be aware of the quality of the goods supplied to them. And if that is so with them, it is still more so with the customer. I have made careful enquiries to see the effect upon the trade, and I can find scarcely a man, certainly not one man in a hundred, except foremen, who makes a full week's wages every week during the whole of the year; and that is an undoubted statement which applies to the whole of the trade in London. Men have to lose time in the course of the year, which materially reduces the standard wages which they are receiving, and a mere statement of wages is no index as to the actual sums which the men receive. The remedies which I would respectfully suggest to you are very few in number. I have but little belief in any remedies which law can make; and unlike the gentleman who preceded me, I have little faith in any compulsory fixing of the hours of labour; I am afraid there will be no means of making them obey it, supposing men were ripe enough to endure them. Also I desire to disassociate myself from the objections which have been made to the introduction of foreign labour in the abstract. I believe much good would result by a compulsory registration of workshops, making it difficult for small masters to exist. I say that distinctly, because a small master is simply a weapon at hand for a large firm to use in competition one against the other. Your Lordships have heard explained by the evidence given you, how employers do pit one small master against the other, and thus continually reduce the status of the men who are working. I would recommend most strongly and most urgently an increase in the number of factory inspectors. At the present time they hardly exist. I worked at one time for Messrs. Maple for 3½ years, and that was the only firm which I worked for under the Factory Act, and during the whole of that time I never knew that at any period the factory inspector came. I do not know whether he did so at all.

3074. You do not know that he did not come, but you are not aware of his having come?

Working for the firm, I was not aware of it during the whole of that period. The result of that is, that there are (I do not say deliberate) evasions of the Factory Act, but breaches of the Factory Act do occur there; they do occur from time to time. One was brought under my notice only a fortnight ago of the work-girls having to take work home after the day's work was done, having got something like seven-and-a-half hours to do when they got home, and after they had done their labour in the factory. I would recommend the extension of the Factory Acts to all workshops. The result would be an improvement in the workshops themselves. Many of them have to work in basements and cellars, and so on, with bad lights and crowded rooms. But above all, I am more hopeful of the results of an exposure; and I believe that the publicity which is being given to this system by your Lordships' inquiries will have, and I know it already has had, a good effect. Even in the case of the firm I have mentioned so freely to-day, but with no personal ill-feeling, it had had a good effect. The last two Saturdays an alteration has been made in the payment of the men in that firm; they have been paid the odd hours which used to be deducted up to within the last fortnight. So that I have more faith in public opinion on this matter than in all other remedies.

3075. I understand from you that you think an infraction of the Factory Acts took place because the work-girls took home work to do in their own homes?

An evasion of the Acts.

3076. You consider that an evasion?

An evasion undoubtedly.

3077. I understand

3077. I understood you to mean that evasion or infractions of the Factory Act took place at Messrs. Maples?
Yes.

3078. And the evasion or infraction you mentioned was that the work-girls would take away work to do at home?
Yes.

3079. That is what you mean?
I do not think any deliberate breach of the Factory Act is intended.

3080. Now, I think you have not mentioned any great amount of sub-contracting; does it exist in your trade?
The sub-contractors are these middlemen, whom we call piece-masters.

3081. But, as I understand from your evidence, the work is given out to these piece-masters; does it go from them to other piece-masters, and so on?
No; it is generally done by these piece-masters themselves. I am not aware that in this particular trade there is any third step beyond the manufacturing firm, and those they give out the work to; these large piece-masters employ boy-labour largely, almost entirely.

3082. To your knowledge, do they work late hours?
No; they work the full hours that the law allows, from eight in the morning till eight at night, not more.

3083. How many people do they generally employ?
It varies; I know of firms where they employ three men and 20 boys, and I know of firms where they employ simply one man and one or two boys; there are a large number of those.

3084. Do those small piece-masters generally work in their own rooms?
No, not in their own homes; in their own workshops.

3085. Not in their dwellings?
No.

3086. How many members are there in your society?
There are two upholstery trade societies in London; we have 230 in ours, and there are 70 in the other; but that has no relation whatever to the number of upholsterers that there are in London.

3087. Do you know what the total number of upholsterers is?
I should say it would be a matter of 4,000 or 5,000.

3088. Then your society comprises a very small proportion?
A very small proportion.

3089. How do you account for that?
Largely by the men's indifference, and it is largely owing to the fact that the society did not adapt itself to the change in the condition of the trade; till latterly they used to insist on every new member being a superior upholsterer in all those branches I mentioned, but the change I have mentioned has prevented the incoming members being proficient in all those branches; but we have adapted ourselves to that change, and are increasing in numbers, but not so rapidly as we desire.

3090. You mean by the change, the change brought about by the sub-division?
Yes.

3091. Does not that conduce to the cheapness of production?
No; I do not think that the best class of upholstery work is cheaper now than it was 20 or 30 years ago; my impression is that it has simply increased the profits of the employers.

3092. You spoke about the large number of firms that do not employ any men at all; are there a large number of such?

In proportion to the number of upholstery firms in the Postal Directory, there are; there are 81 who do not employ, to 69 who do employ.

3093. By saying that they do not employ, do you mean that they get all their work from piece-masters?

No; they are persons who simply do their work for a private family; simply small masters who have their own shop, and work for one or two families.

3094. You complained about the way in which the wages are paid under certain circumstances; I suppose the men are quite aware of those conditions when they accept the work, are they not?

They know that that is the system which is carried on by that firm, and there is a great reluctance on the part of the men to go to that particular firm; it is commonly known as the workhouse in the trade, and men are extremely reluctant to go there.

3095. Do you mean that that particular firm has difficulty in obtaining workmen?

I am not prepared to say that, because there is such a large surplus of labour, but they have a difficulty in finding proficient work; the proficient workmen they have are men who have been trained by themselves into their system.

3096. Lord *Thring.*] You complain, I understand, of the apprenticeship, the apprentices are only for one branch of the trade?

Yes.

3097. Do not the apprentices, or those people who apprentice them, know that when they go into the business they will only be trained to one branch?

No; in the generality of cases they are the sons of persons who are not practical upholsterers, and they go to learn the upholstery, and the sub-division that exists they are not aware of.

3098. This system of insufficient apprenticeship, as you call it, has been going on for years, has it not?

A matter of about five to seven years, at the most; it is quite a new thing altogether.

3099. It must be known now?

It is getting known now, undoubtedly, and those who have endured it, complain the most loudly.

3100. In respect to the guarantee, there is one point I do not understand; take those two horsehairs that you showed us; I understand that one of those horsehairs becomes entirely useless in a very short time, but the other will last for 20 years?

Yes.

3101. Now, supposing that a firm supplied the inferior horsehair instead of the superior, would it not lose its business?

But they would send for it if complaint was made, and have it repaired.

3102. Supposing you employ me to make chairs for you, and you have got to guarantee them, and I bring you an inferior chair or a chair made of inferior horsehair, do you not think you will find it out. What I mean is this: suppose you, being a manufacturer, order me to make a chair, and you tell me to make it a superior horse-hair chair, and I commit a fraud on you and make it of the inferior hair, do you not find it out directly?

No, not for perhaps a week or two, and then the person may say to himself, "I have actually paid more than I ought to have," and if he did, they would simply alter it and make it right; they would trust to chance for its passing.

3103. But a man who guarantees a chair, if he guarantees superior workmanship, and it is inferior workmanship, must lose his business?

It does not happen so; that common hair is the most largely used.

3104. Earl of *Onslow.*] You complained just now of the workman having to work a great number of hours for nothing, because there was a mistake in the way

way in which the couch (to take the instance you gave us) was to be made. Setting aside the question altogether as to whether he had or had not received instructions, do you consider it a hard condition that a man should be required to do the work which is given to him well, or else to do it over again?

Decidedly, a man ought to do his work well; but I think that the hard condition is, that for no fault of his own he has to undo the work which he has done well, to suit some other pattern; it is not a case of bad workmanship.

3105. Then, in fact, it was an exceptionally hard case?

No; I can give you cases of where we have had settees covered in morocco, the morocco being given out by a foreman, and there is a difference of shade in the colour, and fresh morocco is supplied by the foreman to take the place of the wrong shade, and the man is not paid for labour which has arisen from the misjudgment of the foreman, and in that case the man has had a shilling knocked off towards the leather. That I am willing to believe is an exceptional case, but it is invariable, that if a man has to alter a job he is not paid for the work he has to alter.

3106. Then I understand your complaint is against the system?

Yes.

3107. And that system, you say, is that of never paying twice over for doing work on the same article, whether it be the fault of the workman or those who give the work?

I complain that if a man has done work according to orders he ought not to bear the responsibility of the alteration; the person who has committed the error ought to bear the responsibility and pay for it.

3108. And you say that is now the system of that firm; it is not merely in isolated cases, but it is the system?

Yes.

3109. *Chairman.*] And is that the universal custom of the trade?

No, I do not know it in other firms.

3110. Earl of *Onslow.*] Now you say that Messrs. Maple gave up giving their work to some men who they found were using bad material?

I know of a case.

3111. Is not that a proof that they consider themselves responsible to their customers for the article?

Exactly.

3112. And that therefore, whether the article bears their name or not, they consider that they are responsible for the goods manufactured which they send out from their place?

Yes.

3113. Now you expressed an opinion in favour of the registration of all workshops; would you charge a fee for that registration or should it be gratuitous?

I am entirely of the opinion of the last witness, that I would make a fine for non-registration but charge no fee for registration.

3114. Do you think it would be desirable that a list of the places which should be registered under your system should be exhibited somewhere where all those interested could see it?

Yes, most decidedly.

3115. Where would you suggest in a parish?

The vestry hall or the town hall.

3116. That would be sufficient publicity, you think?

Yes.

3117. You stated that your opinion as to the restriction in the hours of labour is contrary to that of the last witness; therefore I will put this question

to you, which I also put to him, as you are secretary of a considerable society: are those opinions shared by the members of your society?

It is a matter on which there is a wide divergence of opinion among our people; the men who are more advanced in the way of speaking their views hold strongly the opinion of a compulsory alteration of the hours of labour; and those men who are most moderate in their views are desirous of waiting until the men are strong enough to demand it for themselves.

3118. You would be of opinion, then, that if an application were made to Parliament to restrict the hours of adult labour there would be considerable difference of opinion on the matter among the workmen?

Yes.

3119. In Messrs. Maple's factory, are there any young persons?

Undoubtedly.

3120. Under the age of 18?

Yes, undoubtedly, a large number of girls.

3121. And, therefore, the factory would come under the Factory Act?

Yes.

3122. When you receive payment for your work, do you receive payment in full?

The employés on the firm receive payment without discount.

3123. It is only to piece-work that this discount applies?

It is only the men who work off the firm who are subject to this discount.

3124. Earl of *Derby*.] I understood you to speak of the practice of one firm of not paying for work which the workmen had been obliged to alter?

Yes.

3125. You do not speak of that as being, as I understand, a system general in the trade, but confined as you allege to one particular firm?

The largest firm in London.

3126. I suppose you do not put it before us as a matter capable of legislative remedy, do you?

No, only it is my desire to bring it under the influence of public opinion.

3127. You said that you wished to extend the Factory Acts to all workshops, and have all workshops registered; would you explain what you mean by a workshop; would you reckon it a workshop if a man works with his own family in his own house?

I would consider as a workshop any place where a man worked for a wage, with the exception of a domestic servant; that is the sole exception I would allow.

3128. Even if he were the master of the house, and working in his own house?

Yes, because I believe there is found to be the inception of the sweating system; a man employing his own family to assist him in labour, and undoubtedly in those cases very young labour is employed to assist the father.

3129. What would be the gain that would result from registering workshops?

They would be brought under the inspection and influence of the officers of the State, and those laws which the State might make with regard to them from time to time would be within the reach of those working there and would be applied. At the present time we have no means of applying what Acts we have.

3130. What you have in your mind is sanitary legislation, I suppose?

Yes, largely. I am also desirous of placing difficulties in the way of the existence of the small masters; I do not believe any good service is performed to the State by their existence.

3131. We

3131. We had one witness who proposed in reference to another trade that it should be unlawful to work except in registered shops; would you go that length?
It must be unlawful to work in unregistered workshops, if you compel all to be registered.

3132. Then you would call any place a workshop where a man worked, even if it were his own room?
Yes, except in the case of domestic servants.

3133. Earl of *Onslow*.] Do you think, in practice, registration without any fee would have the effect of lessening the number of these small sweaters' dens?
Undoubtedly, and it would also assist your Lordships in your endeavour to reach the case of those needlewomen who work under such terrible conditions.

3134. Lord *Clinton*.] I suppose you want the number of inspectors increased, partly that you may find out where these workplaces are?
Exactly.

3135. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury*.] In a very large quarter of London you would inspect every house?
That would be the result.

3136. And in a very large quarter every room?
I am afraid that would be the result.

3137. And the cellars also?
It would be to the advantage of the persons concerned if they were inspected.

3138. Should you combine the sanitary inspection with the factory inspection?
I think there would be an advantage to be gained by their being under the same authority; not necessarily combined in the same man.

3139. You spoke of apprenticeship; but is there any real apprenticeship; is the master bound to keep the boy any number of years?
Not bound in the old-fashioned way of boarding and lodging him; he is simply bound to teach him the trade.

3140. And as soon as he has taught him the trade, or a small piece of the trade, may he send him away?
Yes, and he almost invariably does, unless he is retained at a small increase of wages.

3141. One of the witnesses spoke of the apprentices being succeeded, one set of boys by another, at very short intervals; is that your experience?
As one goes out another comes in.

3142. The word "apprentice" has no meaning then, except to signify just learning the trade?
Yes.

3143. And it may be an apprenticeship of a few weeks only?
It is not a general system I am speaking of; it is simply that adopted by one large firm and a few of the piecemasters.

3144. Do some of them keep boys a long time and treat them fairly, until they have learnt their trade well?
Without apprenticeship. The firm of Shoolbreds do keep lads on without an apprenticeship fee, on the understanding that they behave themselves and learn the trade.

3145. Are those boys taught all the subdivisions of the trade that you spoke of?
No.

3146. Do they only learn one small portion?
Yes.

3147. Can those boys have an opportunity of learning the other portions at the same firm?

I believe not; the firm I am speaking of, is a firm which, unfortunately, does not employ society men.

3148. You spoke of the great subdivision of work at present, and I suppose that is essential, is it not, for the production of the goods?

Yes.

3149. Has it not been a very natural growth?

It is a very recent growth; the subdivision of the trade has come about within the last 10 years.

3150. Has it been done on any system, or has it grown of itself?

It has been done on a prepared and elaborate system, with a view of cheapening the labour.

3151. And with a view of making the workmen less capable?

No, I think not that; but simply as a means of making profit.

3152. And suppose a boy does learn all the subdivisions of the trade?

It is greatly to his advantage; he can get more work readily elsewhere.

3153. But when he does get it he will only be employed on one subdivision of it?

No; in every other firm but these large firms, a man has to do all the branches; and so the consequence is that when a lad leaves these particular firms he has to pick it up in different firms, and my experience is that when they join our society for two or three years they are knocking about until they have finished learning the trade, and get no settled work.

3154. And even in firms where they are very fairly treated they still refuse to teach the boys all the branches?

They do not refuse.

3155. But they practically do not teach them all the branches?

That is so.

3156. Did I rightly understand you to say that you thought the work was sold to the customer at the same prices that it was 20 years ago; that prices are not lower now?

I believe that for good work the prices are not lower.

3157. But the work is very much cheapened?

By the use of this common material, in what I described as second-class work, that is cheaper.

3158. Did you not say that the profits of the masters were very much increased; that the customers did not get articles at a lower price; and that the workmen's wages were lower?

I am, of course, only able to express an opinion of that from deductions; I have no knowledge what their profits are, but you can believe that their profits must be enormous.

3159. If I understood you, you said that the workmen were paid much less, and that the customers paid as nearly as possible the same prices as formerly, and you argued that the profits went into the pockets of the masters to a much greater extent?

Yes.

3160. But is that possible considering what competition is; do not the firms undersell each other; do not they compete so much that it would be impossible if the articles are produced at so much less to sell them for higher prices?

There is a keen competition; but the better-class work I am speaking of is given to firms by families who have dealt with them for years; the competition takes place in estimates for large hotels and large clubs, and then those who subdivide the work and do it on an elaborate system such as I described are far ahead of any other firm that has not such an organised system.

3161. So

3161. So that the work produced in firms that do work for families is as good as ever and the prices are as high?
Yes.

3162. But have the families paid at the same rate as formerly?
The families pay themselves. I am afraid I have not made myself clear. Take an old family that has dealt for years with Gillows; they continue their trade with Gillows; furniture is not a thing which people require from day to day; it is once in a lifetime; and that is not the work which is done by these big firms, but it is in these large hotels and large clubs; it is there that all the competition arises. The West-end firms have no share in it; they have not an opportunity of competing against these large firms for that.

3163. And you mean that there are a large number of firms which treat their workmen well and pay good prices?
I would say the great majority.

3164. It is not the whole trade or the whole body of workmen that are injured?
Not by any means. My evidence is only intended to show that here is a case where the sweating system is being introduced by an elaborate system; I am only trying to show you the inception of the evil which you are sitting to inquire into.

3165. Earl of *Aberdeen*.] You mentioned that a certain practice of a certain firm amounted to not paying men for the number of hours that they worked, and therefore you contended that it was the sweating system?
Exactly.

3166. Is that the general definition of the sweating system in the trade?
No, there is no general definition of sweating; my own definition of sweating is a systematised payment of unfair wages, but there is no general agreed definition of the term.

3167. Is it owing to the fact that a great deal of the work of the firm you mention is done by piecemasters, that there is not an organisation among the men?
It is undoubtedly; because we should not attempt to deal with that firm; we have often been urged to do so, and I have strongly opposed anything in the nature of an attempt to deal with it by means of a strike; it would be folly; they would fill the shop with men and boys from the piecemasters, and we could do nothing.

3168. You understand that I am not suggesting or advocating any particular method of procedure; I am merely asking the question for information?
Yes. Your Lordships will understand that until now the workmen has had no other remedy but to strike for a grievance of this kind. There has been within the last year or two a change in public opinion, which leads us to believe that we have a still more potent weapon in the shape of public opinion being brought to bear upon unfair dealing. We think public opinion is in a state which will enable them to judge of our opinions on these matters.

3169. Has any memorial of any kind been presented to the firm in question with regard to any of the grievances you mention?
Yes, the men have gone over and seen the firm at various times. Sometimes they have been told that their grievance would be considered, that the heads of the firm were not aware of it, and an endeavour would be made to alter it; and a change has taken place for a short time, but the system has gone on again continually. For instance, last year a complaint was made of the matter which I told you has been changed for the last fortnight the payment of the men's money; that has only taken place in the last fortnight, and yet the complaint was made in February twelvemonth.

3170. Is it your impression that a great deal may be done by the agents (the foremen

foremen and managers I mean) in the way of pretty stiff methods of dealing without the knowledge of the principals?

I should be quite willing to believe that if we were not acquainted with the fact that what we complain of occurs in other departments; but, knowing that it occurs in all departments, I cannot believe that the agents are solely responsible.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

HENRY MILLER, having been re-called; is further Examined, as follows:

3171. *Chairman.*] I want to ask you one or two questions arising out of your evidence the other day as to the matter of discount and the payment of cheques to you; you stated, I think, that the discount was sometimes up to 10 per cent. and sometimes as high as 20 or 25 per cent.?

Twenty to 22½ per cent.

3172. I do not understand that you object to the fact that the discount was charged, but to the fact that you did not know what the discount was going to be; is that so?

I knew what the discount should be; according to the agreement, it should be 5 per cent.

3173. Which you do not object to?

No, not the 5 per cent.

3174. What you object to is a larger discount being charged than you were led to suppose would be the case?

Yes; had I known that the discount that was taken off was going to be taken off, I should never have attempted to have made the articles.

3175. Then I understood you also that you were obliged to submit to this discount owing to the fact that the cheques were given to you so late on Saturday that you could not get them cashed?

Not that I could not get them cashed, but the amounts were too large, so that they had to be cashed in the counting-house.

3176. You do not mean that they were too large to be cashed in the bank?

I could not cash them in the bank because every cheque given to me was printed crossed.

3177. Did you ever ask to be paid by an open cheque?

No, I did not.

3178. Why did you not?

At the beginning of my business I could always get them cashed; sometimes, when I did not wish them cashed anywhere else, I could cash them in a public-house, "The Lord Palmerston."

3179. Small cheques only, do you mean?

No; sometimes I could go with a large amount; if the landlord had not the cash in his place he would not do it, but generally I could cash them there.

3180. Do you keep a banking account book?

I did at one time, at the beginning part of my business. With the capital I started with I did have a banking account; but if I paid a crossed cheque into the bankers you could not draw on a crossed cheque, not at once; they would necessarily want the cheque cleared.

3181. Do you mean that your bank would not advance you any money on the crossed cheque of Messrs. Maple?

They would do so, but as a rule, they would not.

3182. The

3182. The bankers you had an account with, would they?
When I shifted the account they did it on one occasion, but they told me they would not do it again; they said that I should have to wait till the cheque was cleared.

3183. I see you say, or are made to say, in your evidence, speaking about an order, "When I wanted to deliver it on the Tuesday night to ensure getting my wages early on Friday," and so on; did you mean Tuesday night or Thursday?
Thursday night, I think you will find it was.

3184. You mean, "When I wanted to deliver it on the Thursday night, to ensure getting my wages early on Friday, so as not to have to wait about on Saturday for payment, I could not get the goods delivered before late on Saturday"; that would be correct?
I had to get the goods ready, and then they had to be inspected by Mr. Regnart; we had to fetch him over to inspect them usually when the goods were ready. On several occasions he would not come over; very often he would not come over until Saturday morning, or the goods would wait on the premises till such time as he did come.

3185. When you took a contract, was any particular day specified for bringing the work in?
No, I had no specified time; it was to be within a reasonable time.

3186. On what day of the week did you generally bring it in?
As he wanted it. When he came over and saw it, he would say, "Send it over at once," but, as a rule, we would not send it over till he had been over.

3187. Do I understand that the work was inspected on your premises?
Yes, on several occasions.

3188. Is it the custom to do that?
Sometimes he would say, "Bring it over," and sometimes not, but "I will come over directly"; that would be on the Wednesday or Thursday, and it would be Friday before he did come over.

3189. Is work sent in on a Thursday?
Every day of the week.

3190. And payments made on every day also?
I have had payments made in the middle of the week.

3191. Not on Friday?
Friday was the day we were generally paid; but when we were pushed I have gone in the middle of the week, but then there has been extra taken off; if I wanted money in the middle of the week there would be an extra discount taken off for having it in the middle of the week.

3192. When do Messrs. Maple close on Saturday?
At two o'clock.

3193. And you could not get your cheque before two o'clock?
Generally you get the cheque before two.

3194. But were not the banks open till three at that time?
Yes; but as I have explained before, the cheques were all crossed; you could not cash them at the bank.

3195. I think you gave us to understand, if I remember rightly, that you were kept waiting until it was too late for you to get them cashed?
Yes.

3196. Lord *Monkswell.*] Was there never any allegation of bad workmanship brought against you when any discount was taken off?
There might have been trifling things, but nothing that was very important.

3197. *Chairman.*] Did you always conduct your business yourself with Messrs. Maple?
Yes. I had a clerk who went over a great deal to Maple's as well, of the name of Fisher.

3198. What did he do?
He used to go over occasionally for orders, and get the money occasionally; then if there was any dispute as to the discount, I used to go over.

3199. Earl of *Onslow.*] Was he your agent?
A servant of mine.

3200. *Chairman.*] Practically, you managed your own business yourself?
Yes, I did.

3201. I would like to understand a little more clearly, if you could explain it a little more, how it was you thought you would have had difficulty in getting work from any other firm if it had been known that you were working for Messrs. Maple. You said when you were examined last time, "I endeavoured to open an account in several other West-end houses, but it is a rule amongst a lot of them, and is well known to Maples, that once you get into the power of Maples and serve them with goods, it is impossible to open an account with other houses"?
I could mention one firm (but I should not like to mention the name) that refused to give me orders.

3202. I want not the name, but the reason?
When I called for it, he said, "We do not give anybody work that supplies Maples."

3203. Had you any idea in your own mind why it was?
It would have been a liberty to have asked him the reason.

3204. I did not ask you why you did not ask him the reason; I asked you if you had any idea in your own mind?
I believe Mr. Regnart himself would not give me an order at the time when I sent some work into Baker-street; he told me I should have to stop supplying this house in Baker-street.

3205. Is this what you mean, that another man would not employ you at the same time that you were working for Messrs. Maple?
That is it.

3206. According to your evidence here, I understood you to mean, that having worked for Maples, you could not get any work to do for any other firm; but as I understand you now, you mean at the same time?
Yes, at the same time.

3207. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Were these goods that you made for Maples all made to an order?
Yes.

3208. Did you take any of them to Maples on the chance of his being able to get rid of them, or were they all made to special order?
He would say, "You must not serve anybody else, but I will take all you can make"; those were his orders.

3209. Lord *Monkswell.*] Do I understand that on every occasion that you had this extra 15 per cent. taken off, it was taken off on the plea that the money was advanced to you, or was any other reason alleged?
The reason was that I was pressed for the money.

3210. But that was the only reason alleged, that you wanted the money advanced, and therefore, if you wanted it advanced you must have the discount taken off?
Yes.

3211. Earl of *Onslow.*] I asked you on the last occasion whether you had any of these statements marked "20 per cent., O.C." ?
No, because they were not in my possession.

3212. You said you would endeavour to get a copy of some ?
Yes, but I did not have the notice to be here till late this morning, and I have not got any copies with me.

3213. What does "O.C." mean ?
Overcharge.

3214. That was not because it was paid you in cash ?
If he thought he could take anything off he would put "O.C.;" for instance, if he overcharged a sovereign he would deduct it, and then take the discount afterwards.

3215. You have worked for other firms besides Maple's ?
Yes.

3216. Did they take off any discount when they paid ?
In one firm, 2½ per cent.

3217. Is that the only discount you had in any other firm ?
And one firm paid net.

3218. Do you say that it is not the general practice of the trade to take off discount ?
Two-and-a-half per cent. I might mention that with one firm I worked for I had 16 *l.* the article, less 2½ per cent. off; but I had 14 *l.* from Maple, and very likely from 10 per cent. to 20 per cent. off.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. THOMAS JELLIFFE, is called in, and having been sworn; is Examined, as follows:

3219. *Chairman.*] ARE you a cabinet-maker ?
Yes, I am a cabinet maker, and secretary of No. 1 Branch of the Alliance Cabinet-makers' Association.

3220. Did you hear the evidence given by Mr. Parnell ?
Yes.

3221. Generally speaking, do you agree with the evidence he gave the Committee ?
Yes.

3222. Are there any particular points you would like to draw the attention of the Committee to ?
This book which I have brought here to day (*exhibiting it*) is the book which was spoken of as being a book that was agreed upon by employers and employés in 1811 to control the working prices of the men in the various shops in the West End of London, that is to say, the best West End shops it was chiefly used in. When a man was given out a job the price, of course, was always worked out according to the details of this book, as every portion of the job is put down in this book, with the price of each section of the job. There is a standard price given to the job; that is to say, there would be a specified price for a specified amount of work, whether it was a wardrobe or any other article; and if there was any more added to that job he would be paid at the rate of so much an hour, or so much a foot in length, height, or width; and the same if there were any deductions to be made, there would be the deductions made.

3223. Will you let me look at that ?
Yes (*handing the book to the Chairman.*)

3224. Were these terms general between the masters and men?
Yes, in 1811.

3225. How long did this continue?
That book has been in use till within the last four or five years, and the reason I think the book has been discontinued is because it was a fair and a just price for the workmen; every workman was paid the same amount of money for his job; there was no giving one man a larger or a smaller amount for his job; the slower workmen generally came off the worst, and the quicker one had the advantage, because the quicker he could make the job the more money he earned. The book does not define any difference to the slow man or the quick man; they both get the same price whether longer or shorter on the job; so that the quick man has the advantage on the system stated there. It is not only fair, but it is just, because the whole of the employers in the West End of London paid then the same price for the work, so that there would be no unfair competition amongst them. There is no doubt that one of the reasons of the book being done away with is because of the unfair competition that now exists in the trade. Generally speaking, these large drapers who have entered the trade, and likewise the large dealers, many of them never employ any man at all, but simply by buying work in, undersell what we call the best firms in the West End of London, although they supply a much superior article to the customers. For instance, I was in the neighbourhood of Old-street last Saturday, and I met a man there who was hawking a dining-table about on a barrow; he took it to one shop and asked the man there to buy it; I suppose they could not agree to terms, because he took it from there to another man; I followed him, and after he had tried another place, I asked him what he wanted for this table. It was a common pine table with birch legs, 5 ft. by 3 ft. 6 in., with one flap to it; it is what is called a common dining-table in the trade. I went into particulars, how much it cost the man to make it, and what he would probably get for it. He told me he wanted 18 *s.* for it, but the probability was that he would not get more than 16 *s.* It cost him 5 *s.* 6 *d.* for the pine tops; it cost him 4 *s.* for the legs; the screw was 1 *s.* 4 *d.*; the screws, glass paper and nails you may reckon at another 2 *s.*; so you see it would be between 12 *s.* and 13 *s.*, I believe, that it would cost him to place that article in the market.

3226. That is for material?
That is for material; and the probability is that he would get 16 *s.*; he only asked 18 *s.* He tried two places, and could not sell it. He would have first of all to go down to the timber yard on the day before to buy the tops, and take them home and joint them up so that they might be ready for the next day; then he would have to go to the turner's to purchase his legs; and probably the next day he would be working hard to get this table done, and on the Saturday morning he would finish it; then he has to get a barrow and take it round, and it might take him half the day before he could sell it. So that the man would be working two days hard, and if he got 18 *s.* he would not be getting more than 5 *s.* or 6 *s.* for his two days' labour; and the labour would be from 8 o'clock in the morning till between 11 and 12 at night, and that we call sweating. I saw a job from Messrs. Light's firm similar to that (only this was a case of dealers, not manufacturers), sold for 34 *s.* 6 *d.*; that would be leaving to them a net profit, if they paid the 18 *s.*, of 14 *s.* 6 *d.*; deducting from that 2 *s.* for polishing of the legs, that would give them 12 *s.* 6 *d.* for the dealing price. We want to point out the unfairness of the system which prevails in these dealing firms; they get the whole of the profits; the workman has scarcely anything for his labour. Simply by buying the furniture, and transmitting it to the warerooms, the dealer gets a large percentage on the goods, and the man that really produces the article gets nil.

3227. Does it often go through more than one firm; you have mentioned a case where the man who made the article took it to the house you mentioned; will they sell it?
They will sell it to some of the firms in this end of the town; then, of course, they get another profit on the top of that.

3228. There

3228. There would be three parties to that transaction?
There would be three parties to that transaction.

3229. Have you ever known more?
I have not known more to my own knowledge.

3230. What do you call in the trade a house like the one you mentioned?
A dealer; they are generally termed dealers. That man has built a very large warehouse within the last few years, an enormous place, which is crammed from one end to the other with furniture which they buy in from these people.

3231. Do they not have often to keep it a length of time before they sell it?
Probably they may, but not as a rule, I think, because they send a lot away into the country to country dealers. If you get an order from that firm and take it in, they charge you 2½ per cent. discount off the price they agree with you. Suppose they pay 1 *l.* for a pair of 3 ft. 6-in. wash-hand stand and table in mahogany, they sell it at 50 *s.*; they have to find the marble, which costs about 5 *s.*, and likewise to pay for the polishing, so that they again get an enormous percentage out of the workman who has to work till eleven or twelve at night to get it done. If by chance you cannot get your work in on the Friday at four o'clock, and take it in on Saturday, this firm charge you 5 per cent. off the amount they had agreed to pay you. It is the same case if they buy a job at the door brought round to hawk, for they beat you down then to the lowest possible price, and yet when you go into the office there is then 2½ per cent. knocked off, so that men who have sold things for 25 *s.* have been obliged to give a discount of 7½ *d.*

3232. Is it not understood beforehand that there will be this discount?
It may be; but when a man agrees to take a price at the door, he should be paid the price he has been beaten down to, because he has already been beaten down to the lowest possible point.

3233. But if he knows of the discount he makes his bargain accordingly?
But he is not able to make a bargain; he has to get rid of the job in order to take something home to the family; he has to take what is offered to him.

3234. It makes no difference to the man whether he sells the goods at 18 *s.* say, and knows that he has 2½ per cent. to be taken off afterwards, or sells them at the door for whatever that amount comes to?
It is 2½ per cent. less. If a man deals with them generally, he knows that he is subject to that reduction; it is the system.

3235. Is that reduction universal?
Yes.

3236. So that every man who makes a bargain knows of it?
Generally speaking he has to be reduced after that. A case came across my notice a few weeks back in Brick-lane, Bethnal Green, where the sweating is carried on to about as great a depth as it is possible to carry it on, where they employ boy labour in making these common pedestal writing-tables, about 3 feet 6 inches by 20 inches, or 4 feet by 2 feet; it has two pedestals with three drawers in each, and a top frame with three drawers there; they make them, generally speaking, out of nine cut stuff, that would be nine boards cut out of a 3-inch plank, somewhere about a quarter thick. These are nailed to the tops and bottoms, which are five-eighths thick, and then the rails which divide the drawers are run in; then they are veneered all over. They are taken in at 25 *s.*, and then they are retailed out again by these people at 2 *l.* 10 *s.* But what I want to bring generally before your Lordships' notice, is that owing to severe competition, the better class of workmen who have to make the work for these superior firms, have to suffer by a reduction of their wages. There is no question but what the wages in the best shops in London have been materially reduced, something like 30 per cent., in this last few years, that is on the price of piece-work or lump-work. That is a system which is different from that

which you have in the book before you, under which a man is paid for every stroke he does; but lump-work is an abominable system, whereby the employers sometimes will give you a drawing which does not always denote the amount of work that is in it, and when you are started on the job they will fix a price for it themselves; they do not give you the option of saying whether you can make it for the price or not, and then they introduce more work; but through the severe competition which we are put to, we invariably have to put up with it.

3237. That is to say, having arranged to do a job at a certain price, additional work is put on to it, and you have to do more than you bargained for?

More work than you bargained for; and you have no remedy unless you take it into a court of law; of course a man cannot always do that. But in Government work the same evil exists in the Admiralty work which is given out at Smee's shop, which is a very old shop in London. When the estimates are sent to that factory they are generally sent all over London, to see how much it can be made for; they take it all over Hoxton or Bethnal Green to see how much the sweaters' shops can make it for.

3238. What work?

Admiralty work, tables, dining-tables, &c. They ask the men first what they can make them for; then they send the drawings round to these sweating shops to ask what they can make them for; then the drawings are taken back to the shop, and the men are told, We can buy these at a certain price, and you must make them for the same. The ultimate result of that is that in many cases the man has to work more than a week for nothing.

3239. How so?

Because the prices are paid so bad; they do not pay them a fair price, so much per hour, but they give them so much for the job, and if they reckon it by day wages, which should be paid, which is 9*d.* and 10*d.*, these men, if they were paid at that rate, would have to work more than a week on the job, because they are so badly paid for it; then, of course, the man is the sufferer. Who gets the profit? There must be some intermediate profit existing somewhere. There is no question that the Government has paid a fair price for it; someone must get this profit in between.

3240. This firm you speak of employ men themselves?

They employ a great many men, and they can invariably do better, on their own work, made in the shop, than they can on this other work.

3241. Do you know that they are putting out Admiralty work?

We know that they send the estimates round to the sweating shops to see what they can be done for.

3242. You do not know that they put the work out?

I could not say positively that they put the work out.

3243. Have you anything more to mention to the Committee?

I do not know that I have much more to say, only that we are greatly reduced by this severe competition. Our old firms, even the West End firm, will send their drawings round to the worst of these shops, to see what they can be done for, and they will tell you that they can buy it at a cheaper rate than you can make it for, so that you must do it at that price.

3244. The competition is altogether at home, not foreign competition?

Not foreign competition, it is the competition which exists at home. If the system contained in that book before you could be adopted, that every man should be paid equally, and every factory pay alike, there would be none of this sweating.

3245. How do you account for this new system having sprung up at all; you say that this book was used down to four or five years ago, how do you account for this sub-contracting having arisen?

I can

I can only account for it by men going into business and working for these large firms, and these dealers, and setting up and buying in goods of men making the job at home and taking it round. In many cases a man has done it when depression of trade has kept him from work, then he has made up a job and taken it round. Some few years back they were paid a decent price for them, but the competition has been so severe of late years that they have not been able to earn a living at it.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Veneris, 11° *Maii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of CANTERBURY.
Earl of DERBY.
Earl of ONSLOW.
Viscount GORDON (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord CLINTON.
Lord CLIFFORD OF CHUDLEIGH.
Lord KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord ROTHSCHILD.
Lord MONKSWELL.
Lord THRING.

LORD KENRY (EARL OF DUNRAVEN AND MOUNT-EARL), IN THE CHAIR.

MISS BEATRICE POTTER is called in, and having been sworn; is Examined, as follows:

3246. *Chairman.*] YOU have had some considerable experience, have you not, in the East-end of London?
Yes.

3247. And from your personal experience do you know a good deal about what is commonly called the sweating system?
In the tailoring trade, but only in the tailoring trade.

3248. How would you define the sweating system?
I should say that an inquiry into the sweating system was practically an inquiry into all labour employed in manufacture which had escaped the regulation of the Factory Act and trades unions.

3249. You do not consider then that sub-contracting is an essential part of it?
I do not consider that contract even is an essential part of it.

3250. Mr. Burnett defines the sweating system as "One under which sub-contractors undertake to do work in their own houses, or small workshops, and employ others to do it, in making a profit for themselves by the difference between the contract prices and the wages they pay their assistants." You would not quite agree with him?
No, because that would exclude all the evidence you have had about the trouser trade. In fact, the worst cases of sweating are cases in which contract does not appear.

3251. What length of experience have you had?
About four years in the East-end.

3252. In what part?
Practically the whole of the East-end; the Hackney and Tower Hamlets district.

3253. You have worked yourself in some of these workshops, I believe?
Yes.

3254. In what parish?
In Whitechapel, Mile End, and Spitalfields. I do not know exactly what the parishes are.

 3255. And

3255. And do you propose to continue working?
No, I have finished the tailoring trade.

3256. Probably you would prefer not to mention particular shops in which you have worked?
I should prefer not to mention them by name.

3257. Does the system pursued in those shops differ materially from the general average?
No. The plan of our inquiry has been this: that we have got important information about 1,300 shops, and then we have classified them more or less into a list, and then I chose one of each class and worked at it; and the only class I could not get at was the top class; it was too skilled. So that I have had the worst though not the best.

3258. Are those shops that do not come under the Factory Act?
Probably the Factory Act does not extend to the lowest class of the work, because the Factory Inspectors do not find them out.

3259. Would the shops where you worked come under the Act?
Two of them would. They would all four come under the Act, but in two of them there are no regulations posted up, and the Factory Inspector has never been.

3260. Could you give the Committee a description, not of the shops you have worked in, but of any similar shop?
Would it not be better to take the different branches of the trade, because it is so very different in one branch from what it is in another?

3261. I should be glad if you would make your explanation exactly in your own way, and at any time you like. What the Committee would be glad to have, would be a description from you, if you would give it, of the shops, and the nature of the work?
Practically the coat trade is in the hands of the Jews, Jewish contractors employing Jew men and, principally, Jewesses, but there are a certain number of Christians who are employed. The Jewesses are the most skilful workers, and if they cannot get Jewesses they get Christian women. The first class, the bespoke work, pays very good wages indeed: the machinists run from about 7 *s.* to 9 *s.* 6 *d.*, and the pressers run from about 5 *s.* to 8 *s.* 6 *d.*, and the women are rarely under 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a day, sometimes they go up to 5 *s.* a day for twelve hours' work. Then the second class, the stock work, is also fairly paid; it is more regular than the bespoke work, but the pay is not quite so high; the machinists run from 3 *s.* to 6 *s.*; pressers will run from 5 *s.* to 8 *s.*, and the women are as low as 1 *s.* 6 *d.*; but there are no women employed in the coat trade lower than 1 *s.* 6 *d.*, except as apprentices, and then, of course, they are employed for what they are worth. Practically, in the coat trade, there is nothing to be complained of in the wages. You have irregular hours, and you have bad sanitation of shops.

3262. What are the hours?
The hours for women of course are the factory hours; but then in the very lowest class, the slop trade, the employers do not pay very much attention to that, and they work till 10 or 11 o'clock.

3263. From what time in the morning?
From eight or half-past till 10 or 11 at night.

3264. When you speak of the coat trade, what kinds of goods are those?
The bespoke trade for the West-end and City shops. It must be distinguished from what is properly called the West-end trade, which is done by English mechanics. The coat made by an English mechanic differs entirely from the coat made by a Jewish contractor.

3265. Could you tell the difference?
Yes; if you gave me a coat I could tell you directly whether it was made by a Jewish contractor or an English mechanic. The Jewish contractor makes his

his coat on the principle of making the coat first, and the lining separately and then sewing the two together by machine right round, so that it is like a balloon, it is bagged in; but in the work of the English mechanic some seams of the lining are tacked to the seams of the coat, and then they are felled over. In the case of a Jewish contractor's coat it is all loose, so that you can pull it apart, and it is like a balloon.

3266. Then you mean to say that the clothes made in the fashionable West-end tailors shops are really made by Englishmen?

They are principally done by the English mechanic. The best work is done in the workshop of a retail house, and the second-class work is done in the house of the English mechanic where he employs his own wife. But a good many West-end firms are beginning to employ Jewish contractors. For instance, a man like Miles, in Brook-street, and the Civil Service Stores, get some of their work done by the Jewish sweaters; but they pay very good prices for it, and the wages of labour are very good; it is only a matter of very long hours; that is the only grievance of those engaged in the best kind of work.

3267. What is the reason that the Jewish women are preferable to the Christian women in the tailoring trade?

They are much more skilful; they can manage machines, whereas very few Gentiles can manage machines; and then they are much more regular in their attendance. In the Free Registry for Jews last winter there were no tailoresses out of employment, though there were a great many tailors, which shows that the Jewish tailoresses are in great request, even in the slack season. Then there is the very lowest layer of the coat trade; that work is done by women and men at their homes; it really does not pay the contractor to take it out. That is the sort of coat that is done for 7 *d.* or 8 *d.*; it hardly pays the Jewish contractor to take that coat out; so that that is done to a great extent by Gentile women. That is the very lowest work; and that is what I mean by saying that sweating, in its most intense form, has nothing whatever to do with the contract system. In fact, the contract system is the top stratum, as it were, of the trade.

3268. This work that is done at home does not go through the hands of a contractor?

No, it is taken straight from the wholesale houses.

3269. The women have to go and get it from the wholesale houses, take it home and finish it, and take it back again?

Yes.

3270. Do they earn the lowest wage?

They earn the lowest wage in the coat trade; they are the fringe of the coat trade.

3271. Working in their own homes?

Working in their own homes. I will give you three representative shops, with the wages, if you care to have that, of the three classes of work. These I have verified; I got them from the workers, and my secretary got them from the employers; and the last one I worked in myself, so I know it. This is a bespoke shop which is making coats at from 5 *s.* to 11 *s.* for the Edgware-road retail shop; they, I understand, had worked for Miles, in Brook-street, but have lost that. The presser gets 8 *s.*; the under presser, 7 *s.* 6 *d.*; the machinists, two men, 9 *s.* and 6 *s.* respectively; general tailor, 5 *s.*; the same at 4 *s.*; plain hand, girl, 12 *s.* a week; button-hole hand making about 3 *s.* 5 *d.* a day; and overtime in this shop is paid. That is one of Mr. Burnett's points in which I think he is mistaken; overtime is paid in the best class of Jewish workshops. Of the English mechanic's coat the standard price is 18 *s.*, and it does not go lower than 11 *s.*; so that you see that the lowest level of the English mechanic is the highest level of the Jewish contractor.

3272. In that shop which you mentioned the contractor would get the work from the retail shop?

He got it direct from the retail shop; he was working for Charles Baker,

 and

and the Edgware-road retail houses. The second shop is what is called a stock trade shop. This shop makes coats for the best export trade at from 2 *s.* to 6 *s.* each, average 3 *s.* 6 *d.* The manager is paid 3 *l.* a week; baster, 7 *s.*; presser off, 8 *s.*; under presser, 7 *s.*; machinists, one man at 9 *s.*, three men at 8 *s.*, one woman at 4 *s.* 4 *d.*, (that is for twelve hours; women's wages are reckoned for twelve hours; therefore the hour and a half which the Factory Act obliges for meals is always taken off); general hands, four women at 18 *s.* a week; plain hands, five women, one at 16 *s.* a week, one at 15 *s.* a week, one at 12 *s.* a week, and two at 9 *s.* a week (the last two are apprentices); button-hole hand, making about 3 *s.* 6 *d.* a day. The last shop is a small slop shop, and this is one I worked at. The man himself does all the basting, fixing, and pressing, and works tremendously long hours. His coats range from 1 *s.* or 1 *s.* 2 *d.* to 2 *s.* He has two machinists, 6 *s.* and 3 *s.* respectively; general hand, a woman at 1 *s.* 6 *d.*; a girl 2 *s.* a week, and lodging and food; she was the niece of the mistress. That man, the week I worked there, turned out 80 coats at 1 *s.*, in five and a half days; so that you can pretty well reckon his profits, which were not very great. I think that exhausts the coat trade.

3273. In that last shop there was one man, one woman, and one girl?
Two Polish machinists, men.

3274. Earl of *Onslow.*] Did the girl do any work besides the tailoring work?
Yes, she worked in the house. She could not really do tailoring work; she was a miserable hand, perfectly unskilled.

3275. *Chairman.*] What is a "general hand"?
A man or a woman who can take the coat from a machinist's hands, and put little things to it, and then give it into the presser's hands, and follow it right through. The plain hand only does the felling of the lining of the arm-holes, and putting on the buttons, and so on. In order to be a general hand, you must know your way about the place; you must understand the way of making coats.

3276. In that last case, was it a workshop or a man's house?
It was done in dwelling-rooms.

3277. Did people sleep in the same room?
Yes; two machinists slept in the shop.

3278. The other two shops you mentioned were larger?
Yes; they were very well-built shops, and very comfortable.

3279. That last one was not comfortable, I suppose?
That depends on what your standard of comfort is. I did not object to it; it was a very small room, but there was sufficient air. Of course it is so very difficult to tell what people's standard of comfort is.

3280. Then the trousers and vests and juvenile suits come under another class?
The trousers and vests and juvenile suits are principally made by the Gentile population of the East-end. There are a few Jewish contractors; more than two. Mr. Lakeman says there are only two, but I know four Jewish contractors in the trouser trade.

3281. How is it that the Jews are so much confined to coat-making?
Because it pays so much better. The Jews will not take up badly paid work as a rule; they cannot get their own people to work for them. The four Jews whom I know who are working in the trouser trade are doing the very best work, and they give very good prices to their hands. I will give you now some particulars of one of the Jewish trouser workshops; this is bespoke trouser work, the same class as the first coat shop I referred to was doing. There are two machinists who are making about 1 *l.* a week; there are finishers who are given 1 *s.* a pair, and a quick hand can turn out five pairs in a day; an average hand can turn out about three and a half, and of course there are degrees of slowness, but in that class of trade a quick hand can make 25 *s.* a week. Then as regards the lower class of trouser work, it is mostly done through

through the distributing sweater, what is called the distributing contractor; that is to say, a man will take out work from a wholesale firm, say 800 or 1,000 pairs of trousers, he will give them out to be machined by one set of women, they will come back to the shop, be given out again to another set of women to finish; and then he will generally press them himself, possibly with some assistance. Now some people would say that man was a middleman, but I say that he has as much to do as the man who manages the workshop; he is as much a superintendent of labour as the man who manages the workshop.

3282. And he himself gives his own labour?
Yes, and his wife generally helps him.

3283. He himself presses the work?
He presses it himself. That class of man will get his trousers machined for from 2 *s.* 6 *d.* to 5 *s.* a dozen, and then the finishing is about the same.

3284. Will they be machined and finished in people's own houses?
Yes, they will be done entirely in the homes of the people. Occasionally they are taken out by a couple of women who are employed, but usually they are done by individual hands.

3285. With regard to the rates of wages that you have mentioned, do the people earn those wages all the year round, or only at certain times?
In the coat shops the average is from three to four days in the week, taking it all the year round; which, of course, brings down the wages considerably.

3286. That brings down the amount they earn in the trade to not very much more than a half?
Yes; rather more than a half, three or four days; only, of course, it comes very busy during the season, and slack during the winter time.

3287. Do you know at all what makes the slack time; I do not mean in the bespoke trade, that I understand, but in the ready-made trade?
It is very difficult to say; I do not understand it. The irregularity is not so striking in the ready-made, but it is a great deal dependent on the shipping orders, on the export trade.

3288. We have had it stated before the Committee that the manufacturers give out their orders very irregularly during the slack time, and that they do so on purpose; is that the case, in your opinion?
I do not think so; I do not think it is worth their while. They want to get it done, as the trade demands it. But there is this to be said about the London trade. It is quite possible (I am speaking of the coat trade now) that in the stock and slop goods the regular orders go to provincial factories, and the irregular and small orders come into the London market, for a very obvious reason; because, of course, the factories can turn out large orders at a regular price, and require them; and the London workshop is always ready to turn out a small order.

3289. Have you found much difference in the condition of the trade during the four years that you have had experience of it?
No, because I was not really studying it four years ago; not this particular trade. I had not very much knowledge of the wages. As far as I saw I do not think they have altered in the four years. There is no doubt about it that prices have gone down. I think that is quite an established fact, but I very much doubt whether the wages of labour have gone down; in fact, I think in the coat trade they have rather gone up.

3290. Have you any opinion as to the effects of the pauper immigration?
The actual raw greener cannot be used in the tailoring trade; he must, at least, have done tailoring at home to be of any use. Then he comes into the workshop and he serves for about three months, perhaps, for a very small wage; at the end of three months he can command as good a wage as anybody.

3291. But how long would it take a man who had no knowledge at all of tailoring to do that?

I do not think he would go into the tailoring trade; he would go into the boot finishing. The tailoring trade is too skilled. You see, if you spoil a coat, you have got to pay for it.

3292. Then you do not think that the pauper immigration has much effect upon the tailoring trade, or any effect upon it?

I do not think it has, for this reason: that in the busy time of the year the machinists and pressers can make their own terms; there are not too many machinists and pressers; in fact, there are fewer than could be absorbed by the labour market, and they can practically make their own terms, and it is rather amusing to see how, in the busy season, they will treat the employers. In the busy season they swear at the employers; in the slack season the employers swear at them.

3293. According to your experience, are the workers in this trade provident people?

Most provident.

3294. They save money in good times?

In every respect the coat trade, which is entirely Jewish, is a remarkable contrast to the trousers and vest trade, which is almost entirely Gentile.

3295. I think you said that in some cases Christians are employed by the Jewish contractors?

Yes, when they cannot get Jews they take Gentiles; they only take them in the last extremity.

3296. In those cases do Jews and Gentiles work together?

Yes.

3297. How do they manage about the Sabbath?

That is a difficulty that is in itself a great inconvenience; that tends to keep them separate.

3298. Do you think that they work on Sunday in those shops?

Yes, I know that in a Jewish vest shop in which Jewesses and Christians were employed, that question came up, and the master, who was a Jew, decided that they should all work on the Christian Sabbath, on the Sunday, and the next Monday most of his hands, including the Christians, left him for a shop where they could work on the Jewish Sabbath.

3299. You spoke about large orders going down to the provinces; do you think there is much competition in that way with London?

In the slop and stock trade there is an enormous competition in the provinces; in fact the provinces are beating London; that is my impression, but of course you will get that very much better from the wholesale houses.

3300. Both in coats and in other things?

Yes; in the juvenile suits you not only have provincial competition but foreign competition too. There are an enormous number of juvenile suits brought from Germany, and that is why the juvenile suit trade is the worst section of the trade as regards wages.

3301. How do you account for it that the foreigners do not compete in ready-made clothing for adults as well as in juvenile suits?

Because the Englishmen will not wear the foreign cut. They are trying to do it, but they cannot get the goods taken; they bring over goods which are cheap, and offer them to the wholesale warehouses, but the Englishmen prefer the English cut.

3302. Does not the great bulk of the ready-made clothing go to the Colonies abroad?

I believe so.

3303. I gather from you that, so far as the coat-making is concerned, you think that the people engaged in that trade are able to take care of themselves?

Yes, except as regards sanitation. In the lowest class of domestic workshop the

the standard of sanitation and overcrowding is very low; no doubt about it; but that is their particular taste.

3304. You think they do not feel it?
I do not think they feel it very much.

3305. That is in shops subject to the Factory Act?
They are not touched by the Factory Act, but they are subject to it, because women are generally employed. But, practically, of course, the Factory Inspector has no power over the sanitation of those shops.

3306. Are they not visited by the sanitary inspector?
A certain proportion of them are, but I think a good many of them escap.e

3307. Do you think it is the case, as has been suggested to the Committee, that the sanitary inspectors think that the factory inspectors ought to attend to the matter, and that the factory inspectors think that the sanitary inspectors ought to attend to the matter?
I do not think the sanitary inspectors want to attend to it at all; as far as I have heard, it is impossible to move them.

3308. Do you think there would be any danger if better sanitation were insisted upon that it might raise the cost of producing these goods?
I think that if better sanitation were insisted upon as regards the shops practically under the Factory Act, it would tend to drive the trade into the lower channels of home work, and that you would have that fringe, as I call it, of the women making a coat for 7 *d.*, getting bigger and bigger. I think if you touch anything you must take the whole thing, and deal with the home work too.

3309. That would necessitate inspection of the dwellings and homes?
Yes, certainly.

3310. Do you think that would be practicable?
I think you could only do it through the landlord; you would have to make him responsible; you would have to make him give notice of any manufacturing process on his premises, and then become liable to a penalty if certain things were not done. Among other things, I think that he ought to write up in the room how many people should be employed in that particular room.

3311. The landlord ought to, you think?
Yes, I think the only way to get at it is through the landlord. You cannot expect these small people, like these women who are making coats for 7 *d.*, to register themselves.

3312. But as it is now, the landlord is responsible, is he not, for sanitation?
Practically not, because he is not responsible to the central authority, only responsible to the sanitary inspector of his district.

3313. You think he ought to be responsible to the central authority?
I would make him responsible to the Factory Department for all manufacturing processes. He has got power of inspection through his weekly rent collector; he ought to know what is going on if he does not.

3314. You think that the landlord in all cases where work is carried on in private rooms ought to be responsible?
Responsible for giving notice to the Factory Department that such and such a manufacture is being carried on, it does not matter what it is, and then he becomes liable by that notice to certain penalties, supposing certain sanitary conditions are not carried out. I would rather make him liable to the penalty than have the inspector come down and tell him, "This ought to be put right," or "that ought to be put right"; because he never does it; but if he is liable to the penalty his rent collector takes pretty good care that nothing is going on that is wrong.

3315. Would not that have a tendency to make the landlord raise the rents?
He might possibly raise the rents; but the truth is that the enormous amount

of overcrowding that has gone on has materially raised rents; because the standard of life of these Polish Jews is so low that they are willing to live six or seven in a room, and they are all willing to pay 1 *s.* a week, so that a man can get 7 *s.* a week for a room; and though making the landlords responsible might raise rents for the time, I do not think it would eventually do so; the people could not afford to pay higher rents. And then again, these model dwellings are practically fixing the rent at the East End by letting out rooms at so much percentage on the capital, like Rothschild's and the East End Dwellings Company, who pay a fixed percentage on their capital, and let the rooms at that rate.

3316. Earl of *Onslow.*] Do they tend to increase or decrease the rent?
To decrease the rent.

3317. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Are these rooms where the overcrowding takes place sub-let, or does the landlord receive payment from each man?
Frequently sub-let. A man will become responsible for the whole house, 13 *s.* a week say, and then he will get lodgers in.

3318. So that the landlord could not be held responsible for the overcrowding?
He ought to be responsible.

3319. *Chairman.*] Do you think that many women have gone into the shirt finishing and trouser finishing, and so on, because their husbands are unable to get work at present?
Yes, undoubtedly they have. I do not know anything about shirt work, but the trouser work is very unskilled; practically, any woman can finish a pair of trousers.

3320. It is a natural thing then for a woman to resort to whose husband is thrown out of work?
Yes. Then as regards the trouser work, there is a great distinction between the in-door and out-door hands. The in-door hands, even in the lowest class of work, can make 1 *s.* 6 *d.* a day, and there is a great demand for in-door hands. The out-door hands, sometimes working very hard, do not make more than 10 *d.* or 1 *s.* a day.

3321. By the in-door hands you mean those working in a workshop?
Yes. The reason of that is that the out-door work is very irresponsible, and very bad, so that the employers have to take it out in one way or another. There is an enormous amount of goods spoiled, and not brought in to time, and that sort of thing, so that the honest have to pay for the dishonest.

3322. Would you be in favour of anything that would tend to stop this out-door work altogether?
I think making the landlord responsible for any manufacturing process carried on on his premises would tend to stop it.

3323. That would have a tendency to drive people into workshops?
Yes.

3324. That would be better, you think?
Undoubtedly.

3325. In fact, defective sanitation is what you principally complain of?
In the coat trade; and low wages in the trousers, vest, and juvenile suit trade.

3326. In fact, that the unskilled labour does not command anything like so good a price as the skilled labour does?
Yes, it is a matter of skill really what the wages are.

3327. Have you ever considered the desirability of doing anything to check pauper immigration; putting on a poll tax, for instance?
I am afraid if you put a poll tax on it would simply be paid by the employer, and you would really be instituting the slave trade at the docks.

3328. You

3328. You mean that the employers would go down and pay the poll tax, and then the man would be entirely in their power?

Yes; I think that the only way of really stopping immigration is to enforce a higher standard of life, and that is why I propose that the landlord should be responsible for overcrowding, and want of sanitation, which really makes the rent dearer.

3329. Do these people live very poorly?

The Polish Jews live on almost nothing. I should like to say one word as to the Jewish community. Taken as a whole, there is no doubt about it that the Jewish community at the East End is shifting upwards; that there is that distinguishing feature between the East End Jews and the Gentiles; the East End Gentiles are going down, and the East End Jews rising up.

3330. And are the Polish Jews distinguished above other Jews by their ability to live on very little, and on very inferior food?

The Polish Russian Jews, I should think, have the lowest standard of life of any.

3331. They could probably survive, and even thrive, where an Englishman could not live?

Yes, undoubtedly. There is this point that ought to be clearly brought out, that the Jewish tailoring trade and the Gentile tailoring trade are in water-tight compartments. Jew and Gentile workers are in distinct compartments, and do not compete with each other. On the other hand, there is competition between two systems of manufacture, between that of the Jewish contractor and that of the English mechanic.

3332. Practically the Jewish community are quite apart?

In the tailoring trade.

3333. Do you know anything at all about the management of the Jewish Board of Guardians—how they take care of their poor?

It is admirable. The whole of the Jewish charities in the East End make one quite blush for the Christian charities by the way in which they are managed, they are so thoroughly organised. Then as regards any pauperising effect of the action of the Jewish Board of Guardians, it must be remembered that they are not only a Board of Guardians, but that they stand in the position of the Charity Organisation Society to the whole of Jewish philanthrophy; so that the amount of help they give must not be calculated on the same basis as if it were given by an English Board of Guardians; it must be calculated on the same basis as an English Board of Guardians, plus all Christian charity.

3334. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Do you think that relief in itself has a less pauperising effect among the Jews than among the Gentiles?

Yes. The Jew takes money to make profit by; the Gentile for drink principally.

3335. *Chairman.*] Do you think that this admirable organisation of the Jewish Board of Guardians has a tendency to induce Jews to come over here from Germany and Russia?

I do not think the organisation of the charity has a tendency to do that; I should think it had a directly reverse effect. The charity itself, of course, may have a tendency to do that, but that is not the fault of the Board of Guardians; they have to deal with this huge fund of Jewish philanthrophy in the West End and apply it to the East End. If it were not for the Jewish Board of Guardians, I think there would be more attraction to foreign Jews to come over here, because there would be the same amount of charity given in an irresponsible way, and given principally in the necessaries of life.

3336. Have you thought at all about the advantages of having workshops registered?

I should be afraid of driving the trade into a lower channel.

3337. I mean without charging a fee; merely that they should be registered in such a way that their existence should be known?
Would they be liable to a penalty if they were not registered?

3338. It has been suggested to the Committee that they should be?
I think that would come very hard upon the poor employers, who probably would not know anything about it—on the domestic employers. I prefer to make the landlord responsible.

3339. Your principal remedies or suggestions would be that the landlord should be made responsible, and that sanitation should be better looked after?
Yes, if you do anything. Of course I think there is a good deal to be said for doing nothing; but if you do anything I think you must extend the remedy over the area of the evil. You must not just take the top part of it and deal with that alone, and drive the trade into the lower channels.

3340. When you say that the Jews and Gentiles do not compete with each other, you mean in the coat trade only?
The Jews, practically, do not touch the trouser and vest trade, and the Gentiles do not touch the coat trade practically. Of course there are isolated cases the other way.

3341. But is it not the fact that Christians were employed in this coat trade formerly?
This coat trade did not exist till the Jews came over.

3342. Since when has it existed?
That I cannot tell you; but the Jew brought in the sub-division of labour in the making of the coat.

3343. And you would say that, in your opinion, Jewish immigration had not been the cause of depriving Christians of work or of pauperising them?
Not in the tailoring trade.

3344. I think you mentioned in what parishes your experience has been?
Our inquiry extends over the whole of the East End?

3345. But I mean your own personal observation?
Mile End, Spitalfields, Whitechapel, and St. George's-in-the-East.

3346. All those districts you know yourself?
Yes; I was rent collector to a population of about 700 people in St. George's-in-the-East, and there I made my observations about the Gentile work, the trousers and vest work.

3347. Have you anything further which you would desire to state to the Committee?
No, I do not think so.

3348. Lord *Thring.*] Do you, or do you not, think it is advisable that we should legislate at all; in other words, should we let it all alone or not?
I really have not any opinion about it.

3349. But you do not think there is a very strong case for legislation?
Not in the tailoring trade.

3350. Earl of *Onslow.*] I understood you to say that you did not know of any case in which the Factory Inspector had made an inspection of any workshop in which you were working?
No, I did not say that. There were only two shops in which I was working which I was told by the employer had not been inspected by the Factory Inspector; but they were very small domestic shops. The other shops I was working in had the regulations written up, and were regularly inspected.

3351. Then it is not your impression that the Factory Inspector is negligent of his duties?
No; I think the Factory Inspector has done an enormous amount of good in the East End.

3352. Do

3352. Do you think that he knows where the factories are which come under the Factory Act?
He has a great number of them, but he has not got all.

3353. Are those that escape his observation the worst cases?
Yes, undoubtedly.

3354. Have you any observations to make on the book called No. 40, in which the master has to keep the overtime of the female hands; can you say whether that is kept properly or not?
I should think it was kept properly in the upper class of workshops, but, of course, it is paid no attention to in the domestic workshops; they know nothing about it. And not only that, if the employer can say that they are all his relations, the Factory Inspector cannot touch it.

3355. Then you think that a great deal of female labour is worked overtime, and no return of it is made to the Factory Inspector?
Undoubtedly. I should not like to say that that female labour would come legally under the Act, because in many cases it is the relations of the employer who are doing the work.

3356. These are what we have heard called in the Committee the family workshop?
Yes.

3357. What is the general behaviour of the sweaters towards those whom they employ; is it of a merciful or of a brutal character?
They seem very much like other men; there is a good deal of geniality and kindness, I think, in the East End workshop; that is my experience of it.

3358. We have heard that very short hours are allowed for meals; is it your experience that employés in the shops that you have known were obliged to take their tea while they were working, and were not allowed any regular hours?
That again is a matter for classification of the shops. In the bespoke and stock shops I should say that the meal times were kept as a rule, but in the small slop shops they take them as they can get them, not because they are not allowed to take them otherwise, but because they all agree to do it.

3359. In fact, in that way they do more work, and therefore get more wages?
Yes.

3360. The more they work the more wages they get?
Yes, except that it applies to the class of shop where wages are very low comparatively.

3361. Then I understood that you are in hopes that something might be done towards driving the trade out of the very lowest class of workshops into the better ones, the factories?
Yes.

3362. Do not you think that that might have the effect of driving the trade out of London altogether?
Quite possible.

3363. You would not look upon that as a great misfortune?
No.

3364. Do you think that it might have the effect of driving it still further out of England?
No; you could not drive it out of England as regards coats, trousers, and vests, because English people will not take a foreign cut. I was told by a large clothier that he had an offer of a French firm to make coats at a ridiculously small price of very good material, but for the reason I have mentioned he could make no use of it. That was a big wholesale house.

3365. In fact, there is a style about English clothing that there is not in foreign clothing?
Yes.

3366. Then, as I understand, you are not opposed to the registration of these workshops so long as the onus of making the registration falls on the landlord and not on the tenant?

Yes, so that it should include home work. I look upon the home work as the lowest channel of the trade, and that must be included in any remedy.

3367. Then if on any landlord's premises work is carried on for gain it would come within your definition?

Yes.

3368. Do you think that it would be possible for the landlords to know whether such work was being carried on on their premises?

Yes, by their rent collector; the rent collector must visit every dwelling every week. Practically it would come to this: that in the case of home work the landlord would be responsible; but in the case of a large employer who took the premises on lease, the landlord would protect himself as regards penalty by a clause in his lease.

3369. Do you think that rents have reached their maximum, or do you think it would be possible to extort even higher rents?

I think, if there is an indefinite immigration, they will not have reached their maximum, unless we go on pulling down buildings and building them up as model dwellings, on the basis of so much return to capital.

3370. Then you do not think that increased restrictions on the landlord, such as you suggest, would have the effect of raising rents?

No; in many of the parishes in the East End, in St. George's-in-the-East for example, there are rooms and rooms vacant, large blocks of dwellings almost entirely vacant.

3371. I understood you to say that the only way you saw of stopping immigration was by raising the standard of living; would not that rather tend to attract immigrants?

No, they would find it too expensive to live here. If they came on the Board of Guardians they would be sent away home, or sent abroad. Practically they would have to spend more on rent, because they would have to have one room each instead of seven living in one room.

3372. Do you think that the excellent administration of the Jewish Board of Guardians, which is probably well known all over Europe, has any influence in attracting immigrants to come to London?

It is very difficult to say; I suppose, to a certain extent, it has.

3373. You have not heard from themselves that they have come over for that reason?

No; they have come over because friends of theirs are here, usually.

3374. We have heard that when these immigrants land they only know three words of English, and that those three words are "Board of Guardians"; you do not think that is quite an accurate statement?

I should think that is a bit of sensationalism.

3375. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] Is there anything of what is known as the learning system in the trade?

The apprenticeship system, do you mean?

3376. The system which I have heard of where young persons are induced to work at the trade from the prospect of being taken on permanently after they have learnt it; does that exist in the tailoring trade?

Yes, it exists in the trousers and vest and juvenile suit trade to a large extent. There are one or two large wholesale firms in the East End who pursue that method of employment, and they do advertise largely for learners, and they use them; and then, as it is unskilled work, they are brought up to a trade which is practically of no use to them, and they are turned loose when they come to ask for wages.

3377. How

3377. How long do they work at it without receiving wages?
I should think they very seldom begin without any wage. They begin with about 1 s. a week.

3378. To be continued for, say, three months, and then discharged?
Possibly; I really have not any personal knowledge of it only from hearsay.

3379. I think you mentioned that the coat trade was exclusively Jewish, and the trouser and vest Gentile in the main?
Yes, practically; although there are isolated cases of exceptions to that.

3380. And are the employers in the trouser and vest business Gentiles?
Yes, practically; English and Germans. There are a certain number of Jews, but a very few, and they are principally in the best class of the vests and trousers.

3381. It was through the Jews, you stated, that the introduction took place of the sub-division of labour in the tailoring trade?
Yes.

3382. Might it not have the effect of reducing wages amongst the Gentiles in this sense, that the superior class of work, and therefore the higher wage, would be limited to one section of the population, instead of being distributed?
The whole question turns on this: whether the export trade has practically been created by the Jews; and that is a disputed point.

3383. I was alluding rather to sub-division of the descriptions of work in the same trade. I will put it in this way: Supposing under the former system in a family there was one clever worker who would get therefore better pay to do the coat, and the others less skilful did the trousers and vests, that would have the effect of bringing a larger wage to that family than under the present system, where the Gentile does the whole of the business in the trouser and vest department?
You see the Gentiles have their fair share of the coat trade in the best West End bespoke trade, which is entirely monopolised by English mechanics; the Gentiles have never done the other coat trade.

3384. You are speaking still of persons living in the East End?
Yes.

3385. Is the sanitation in the shops where the coat trade is carried on worse than that where the trouser and vest work is done?
Yes, I should think it was. You see the trouser and vest work is mainly done in the homes of the individuals, and you cannot have quite such objectionable sanitation in the home of a person as you can in a workshop in which a certain number of people work.

3386. In regard to the blocks of model dwellings which are vacant, have you formed any opinion as to the cause of that dearth of tenants?
Of course, at present, a great many industries are leaving London; the dock industry, for instance, is leaving London.

3387. It is not due to any stringency in the regulations that these model dwellings are vacant?
No, I do not think so. I think it is partly that these model dwellings really supply much more room than the dwellings did which were on the same sites.

3388. Although that is the case in some quarters, still there are blocks of buildings which are crowded, and very much in demand?
Yes.

3389. Do you think that immigration from abroad is likely to increase like a snow ball, from people coming, as you have told us they come, because their friends are here?
I am afraid I am not competent to answer that question.

 3390. Lord

3390. Lord *Sandhurst.*] We have had some very strong evidence on this Committee as to the exceptional poverty of the tailors and tailoresses; from what you have seen of them do you consider that they are a population in extremely miserable circumstances?

Not the Jewish section, and not the coat trade.

3391. But the Gentile population?

Trouser, vest, and juvenile suit makers are exceptionally poor.

3392. Did you hear of any case of starvation?

Not of actual starvation.

3393. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Can you say whether it would be at all possible for a rent collector to know exactly whether a room was sub-let. For instance, if a man was sub-letting his room and making about 2 *s.* or 3 *s.* a week from sub-letting it, could he not prevent the rent collector from knowing how many people were living in the room?

But if the landlord were subject to a penalty he would insist on the rent collector having the right of inspection; and practically a rent collector has the right of inspection.

3394. You mean that the tenant would not make any objection to his coming in?

No, they never do.

3395. Lord *Monkswell.*] About the poll tax on foreigners; do not you think that the poll tax might deter foreigners from coming?

No, I do not think it would.

3396. Do you think there would be any object in preventing the influx of foreigners by a poll tax, or in any other way, if over crowding were put an end to?

No, I do not think there would be.

3397. Earl of *Onslow.*] Do you think that the sweater himself, in the lower class of workshops, makes a very large profit?

No. Where a sweater makes a profit, it may be taken as a general rule that he pays his hands well. In the lowest class of work he makes, I consider, less money than his machinists and his pressers.

3398. We were told that a great number of these sweaters do not do any work themselves; that they simply superintend; is that so according to your experience?

That would apply to a very small number at the top of the trade, and those would be just the men who would be paying very good wages.

3399. Then you could not say, with truth, that the sweaters, as a rule, are wealthy men and are making large profits?

No; and they are all, more or less, in their workshops, and none of them live off the premises.

3400. You are speaking of the tailoring trade only?

Yes, only of the tailoring trade. The boot trade is quite different.

3401. With regard to the two inspectors, the inspector of the local authority and the Factory Inspector, are you of opinion that the duties of sanitary inspection and the inspection of the workshops should be vested in the same individual?

I think the workshops should be put on the same footing as the factories.

3402. But, as you are doubtless aware, at the present time all that the factory inspector can do, where he finds cases of insanitation, is to point them out to the inspector of the local authority, and suggest that he should take steps to remedy it?

Yes, that is the workshops. In the case of factories he is the last authority himself, is he not? I should put the workshop on the same footing, in fact all manufacturing processes.

3403. But

3403. But the inspector of the local authority has concurrent power in the workshop; would you wish to see that done away with?
Yes, I should wish to see that done away with.

3404. *Chairman.*] You said that you did not think that orders were given out capriciously by the manufacturers; do you think that there is any favouritism in giving out work on the part of the foremen?
There is undoubtedly bribery of foremen to a very large extent. I know in one wholesale house they have dismissed seven foremen running for taking bribes.

3405. You think that the bribery is done without the knowledge and against the wishes of the manufacturer?
Undoubtedly.

3406. Is it a fact, do you think, that the model dwellings are unpopular with the people?
That is a feeling which is very much decreasing on the part of the working people, especially now that they are being built on a more rational principle. Rothschild's buildings are quite full and very much in demand.

3407. Is there any peculiarity about them?
They are admirably planned for the purposes of the poor.

3408. And that makes them more popular?
Yes. About model dwellings it is a mistake to suppose that there are not sweaters' dens in them, because in some of the model dwellings the worst sweaters' dens are to be found; so that the model dwellings, in themselves, have not done away with the sweaters' dens.

3409. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] You mean the worst instances of overcrowding?
Yes, the overcrowding is as great there as anywhere.

3410. *Chairman.*] How long have you been at work in the tailoring trade?
Three weeks, inclusive of the training I got.

3411. The whole time in one shop?
No, I worked altogether in five shops, but I could not keep my place in the coat shops, for the reason that coat work is so very much more skilled than other work.

3412. You worked the usual 12 hours a day?
Yes.

3413. Besides that, you have had a large personal experience of the way work is carried on in people's homes?
Yes, as a rent collector.

3414. Taking the tailoring trade as a whole, it appears that the English have got the top of it and the best of it?
Yes.

3415. And the bottom of it and the worst of it?
Yes, English women. You have practically the English mechanic doing the best hand-sewn goods; then the Jewish contractor taking all the other coats; and then you have the Gentile women doing the lower branches; viz., the vests and trousers.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. CHARLES FREAK, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

3416. *Chairman.*] You are Secretary of an Association?
I am Secretary of what is known as the National Union of Boot and Shoe Riveters and Finishers.

3417. That is in the East End of London?
Yes.

3418. Is that society a Christian society or Jewish?
A Christian society.

3419. Entirely?
Not entirely; we have some Jews. The only Jews we have are those who work on the same system as the English people, not on the sweating system.

3420. What does your society number?
The branch that I represent has about 1,600 members.

3421. Are there any other branches in London?
There is one in South London.

3422. No other branch in East London?
No other branch in East London of our Union.

3423. Have you any idea how many persons there are in the boot-making trade in the East End of London?
I do not know; I should think there are some thousands.

3424. Will you give the Committee any information that you wish on the subject before them?
In respect to the branch of the trade that I represent among the Christians, since 1875 our wages have been practically stationary; we have just about the same wage now as we had in 1875; and that prevails on the Christian houses generally; but on the Jew houses, the Jew manufactories, where the sweating labour is employed, the wages have been reduced at least 30 or 40 per cent. during that time. They work on a different system to us, and I think it is necessary for it to be understood that this sweating work is not carried on in the hand-sewn work. The boots generally worn by ladies and gentlemen in the West End of London are not affected by this sweating work at all; but in the machine-sewn branch of the trade, that is the branch of the trade that I represent, the work is divided among Christians in two parts. The one part is called lasting, that is, putting the leather together in a rough shape; and the other is called finishing, that is, embellishing the boot so that it will be fit for wear. The first part is generally done in the manufactory, that is, in the Christian houses; there are some that work out-doors even at that part; but it is in the second branch of the trade where the sweating is carried on to a larger extent. In the lasting department it is carried on among the Jews in Petticoat-lane, and round that neighbourhood; but it is more particularly in the finishing branch of the trade that it is carried on. The work is given out from these big Jew firms (I could give names; I do not know whether it is necessary), and the boots are taken home, and if the man who takes them home is not particularly greedy he knifes his own work, and then he employs about three men, to whom he gives the finishing of the work after it is knifed; and he pays for that half the wages that he receives from the employer. Hence the man that takes the work out receives the same wage as the three men whom he employs. But there are plenty of them who are not satisfied with this, but employ knifers who do the trimming of the edges, and pay them so much a dozen for that, employing finishers to follow the knifer.

3425. How much a dozen?
If it is 5 *s.* per dozen boots they generally pay 2 *s.* 6 *d.* to the finisher per dozen

dozen, and if they employ a knifer, about 1 *s.* a dozen for knifing, so that he would make 1 *s.* 6 *d.* a dozen on that work which he had done no labour on at all, further than taking it from the shop and back to the factory again.

3426. You are speaking now of Christians, are you?

No, I am speaking of foreigners. As regards the sweating system very few Christians work at it at all. In the Christian houses the workmen are simply employed in two parts: one man to last the boots, to put the stuff on; another man finishes the boot right out with his own hands, and he receives his wages for it, and finishes himself, and employs no labour; whereas the Jewish foreigner takes it out and employs finishers to follow the knifer, and pays them half the wage. He would knife for three men; he would therefore earn the wages of three men. But in the case of employing the knifer as well, it is made much more profitable for him; and the result of this system as regards Christian labour is such that it has reduced the wages to such an extent that a Christian really could not, working ordinary hours, get a fair livelihood.

3427. I thought you said just now that wages have gone up among the Christian workmen?

In the Christian houses the wages are about the same as they were in 1875; but the Jewish houses, by the sweating system, have produced cheap goods, and therefore they have taken away from the Christian houses to a very large extent the middle and commoner class of work that they had previously made, and these are made by the Jews at a reduced price, indeed at such a price that a man working single handed would have great difficulty in getting a livlihood. It is common for these men to start on work at six o'clock in the morning and work steadily along till 12 o'clock at night. This has been borne out by our meeting the men themselves, who have stated that such is the truth; and we inquired of them as to what the average earnings were, taking the year through, and they did not average more than from 12 *s.* to 15 *s.* a week. I met one finisher the other day who considered himself a very swift finisher among the Jewish sweaters, and he said he should be well off if he averaged 18 *s.* a week.

3428. You mean by a "sweater" the person so sweated?

Yes, what you generally called the sweatee, in our trade we generally call the sweater; the others we call master sweaters.

3429. What you say comes to this, as I understand you: that the Jewish workmen have taken from the natives, the Christians, a certain class of work?

Yes.

3430. And that has not had the effect of reducing the rate of wages, but they have entirely taken from them a certain class of work?

They have been the cause of reducing the wages on the houses that they work for; and of course if Englishmen go on those houses (and there are a few that do so) they have to put up with the reduced wages; but on the houses that employ exclusively Christian labour there has been no reduction.

3431. Is the amount of foreign competition still increasing?

I think it is.

3432. Do I rightly understand that you have no strong opinion one way or the other about it?

I have a very strong opinion that it is increasing, but how much I do not know as a fact; I have no means of calculating exactly the numbers. I know that if we went back 10 or 15 years, we scarce felt any effect then of the foreigners being in the neighbourhood at all; and that you could scarce find anything out from them if you did find any of them working at the trade; but they state themselves that the wages have been so reduced the last few years that they feel they cannot go on without some effort being made to improve their position. I have been endeavouring to form a society among them, at their request; and after about four years we have succeeded now in getting a society. In fact there are two; there is a society started by master sweaters, as they find that the big Jew manufacturers, by putting one in competition with the other, have reduced their labour; so that they feel that they are not able

able to get on nearly as well as they used to do; and there is also one among the slaves, I can call them nothing else, men that never go to a factory with the work, or see the man for whom they do work; they say that they cannot live. One of them significantly said to me, "Well, I wish you would do something, Mr. Freak, for we cannot work more than 24 hours a day"; and it is a fact that they do work continuously 20 hours a day, and are doing so now.

3433. Is this work done in the factory?
In the lasting department; the finishing department is only done out doors, but in that case each man takes his day's work, and shops his day's work, and works also himself, not on the sweating system.

3434. Do you think that combination among the Jewish sweaters would be sufficient to remedy the evil that is said to exist?
I am afraid that they are so poor spirited, so crushed in spirit, that they have not got the courage to combine to resist the position that is being imposed on them.

3435. Is there much competition from the provinces in your trade?
There is some, but not affecting the labour that these people are employed in; it affects more particularly the better class goods made on Christian houses. There is not a Jew employer in London at the present time that pays the trade wages, not one, and invariably they pay about half what is paid in some of the other firms, and it is continually cut down at the wicket. I myself went down to a large firm in the City for the purpose of seeing some of those foreign workmen shopping their work, and I met some of them there (this was last Friday night), who stated that they had been at the wicket from four to nine o'clock to shop their work; five hours they were standing there to get their work from the firm, and then they say (and there is no doubt about it) that when they get home they must knife that work, or else their men will have nothing to do in the morning. Hence they have to stay up nearly all night to knife the work, so that the finishers can start finishing the work when they go in in the morning.

3436. Have you any idea why they are kept waiting in this way?
I have no idea, but it is continuous in those places; and, what is more, I know that the system of bribing the foreman is carried on between them, for I have this significant illustration of that. I had a meeting of the master sweaters, as we call them, and it was a pretty good meeting, and one of them raised the question in the meeting (it was their ordinary trades' meeting) about someone having paid some money to the foreman for the purpose of getting more work. I said, "Surely, as men, you can put down such a system as this"; the reply was, "Some time or other we have all done it." That was the reason they could not bring him to account.

3437. I gather from you that you think the remedy lies in the direction of combination among the Jewish workmen?
Well, I should think that would assist it, but I really think that there is something for the Government to do in the matter. I do not think it is right for men who live in this country that they should be starved out of an existence, and it is so among the classes of work whereby men learn the trade. A man cannot put a lad on our better class of work to learn the trade; he would have to begin to teach that lad on the commoner class of work, but these people seem to be taking away the work that our people learn on, and there is practically nothing to teach the lads on; and while I believe in a man going abroad where he chooses, or people coming here, and I would not check them, because I believe in a man being a citizen of the world as far as possible, yet I do object at the same time that the very poorest, miserablest class of men in the world should all be emptied into England to destroy English labour, and that seems to me to be the case with respect to those that come from Poland and Russia.

3438. Do you think any large quantity of English labour has been displaced in the last 10 years?

There

There must have been a considerable amount displaced by these people, because they work twice the hours that any Englishman will work, and there must be some two or three thousand of them employed in the shoe trade alone, down in the East End of London.

3439. But what I want to get at is this: do you know that work that was being done by Englishmen, say 10 years ago, is now being done by Jews?

Yes, what we term the commoner class of goods. An English firm used to make the best glacé kid right down to the commonest mock kid, and the commonest stuff made; but the firms that paid the statement wages, had to drop the commoner work altogether, and make the best work, and this other class of work has drifted into the Jew firms.

3440. What has become of the Englishmen who used to do this work?

They are more or less unemployed; I do not think that they are gone out of the trade; but last winter we had hundreds walking about; they did not join in the ranks of those who walked about as the unemployed, because they would have their tools in some factory, waiting for a job to come along, but I know there are hundreds of men in the East End of London that did not get more than 10 *s.* or 12 *s.* a week, and a man cannot pay rent in London and keep a family on such wages as that.

3441. Is there any influx of agricultural labourers, or men in other trades, into your trade in London?

No, they do not touch our trade in London; we have shoemakers coming from the provinces, but not agricultural labourers.

3442. If any restrictions were put upon immigration, or any legislation took place, would it not be likely to increase the cost of these cheap goods?

I think not in a manner that would be of any serious consequence, because it is only a few pence per pair, which makes all the difference in the wages, and I do not think the few more pence per pair necessary would be the means of prohibiting their being made.

3443. A great deal of them go abroad, do they not?

Yes, a great deal of them.

3444. Is it not the fact that there is competition on the part of foreign countries in the export trade ready-made goods?

I think not; there is one class of goods in which there is foreign competition. Pinet of Paris competes with our very best class goods, but then he charges more than we do.

3445. I am speaking of the export trade; you do not think there is foreign competition in that?

I think not.

3446. You are not afraid of foreign competition?

We are not at all afraid of it.

3447. Earl of *Onslow.*] Did I understand you to say that, as the result of Jewish competition, it was impossible to apprentice lads to the boot trade?

I do not say it is impossible; but to teach lads, it is necessary to have a common class of goods to make, and as far as London is concerned, that common class of goods has drifted entirely, or almost entirely, into the Jew firms.

3448. Is it not usual, when a lad is apprenticed, to apprentice him without receiving any remuneration for his work?

There are very few apprenticed in our trade now.

3449. But generally in apprenticing, does not apprenticing mean that the lad is bound to the trade, and either makes a payment or receives no wages for the time while he is learning it?

I do not know what the system is generally with regard to that; as far as it goes now, there is no need of apprentices, and none are being apprenticed to the trade that I know of.

3450. That is to say, that apprenticeship does not exist?
It does not exist in our trade.

3451. We were told, in regard to the coat trade, that the Jews brought it over, so to speak, with them; that that has sprung up in the East End of London in consequence of the Jews coming over here; that is not so, I understand, in the boot trade?
No, it is not so with us.

3452. With you it has displaced an existing trade?
It certainly has.

3453. Has the price of ready-made goods fallen within the last few years in the boot trade?
Yes, I should think it has.

3454. Therefore, from some cause or other (perhaps you are not prepared to say that it is owing to immigration), the purchaser is in a better position now than he was before this immigration took place?
No, I do not think he is, because the class of work that is made is such a class of work that the goods, to a very large extent, do us injury in our foreign trade, and I believe they are not much good to the people who buy them. Nearly all the Jew firms use a lot of what is known as "composition" in our trade, and plenty of paper; the boots are certainly cheaper in price, but they are nasty when you get them. But I think if you take boots generally, they are cheaper then they were; but I believe that comes out of the fact of employers being satisfied with less profits than they were some years ago; I know they work at less profit.

3455. Then you say that, though the article may be cheap, it is of a worse quality?
Yes.

3456. And that therefore the purchaser has not reaped any very large benefit from the Jewish immigration?
Yes.

3457. Earl of *Derby*.] Do I understand you to say that if the immigration of foreign workmen were checked, it would lessen the complaint of the excessively low wages you speak of?
I think it would very largely.

3458. Do you think that the competition among native workmen would not be sufficient to keep things at their present level?
No.

3459. Why do you say that; is it because the English workmen would unite?
The English workmen all have a tendency to form unions; we have a tolerably powerful union; but not only is it a fact that we have a large number in union, but to a very large extent those who do not belong to the union are governed by the action of the union.

3460. But suppose there are more persons wanting employment in that particular branch of business than are able to find it, what good will the union do in that case; there must be competition among them to obtain work?
We should advocate as far as we could the reduction of hours to such a time as that they all had employment, and increase the hours when there was a greater demand for their labour; but with the Jew, he does not care where the work comes from, or who is out of work, he will simply go on working 16 or 18 hours a day, and if he cannot get the work at the price he has been receiving, he will often do it for less, so as to cut down the wages even of his fellow Jew.

3461. Then what you complain of is that they compete with one another, with no regard to the general interest?
They have no regard whatever to the general interest.

3462. And

3462. And do you find that among English working men they will not underbid one another?

Not to any great extent; there are some that will do so; but there are none of them that will work 16 or 18 hours a day continuously, and take work at any price to carry on that work.

3463. Have you ever in your trade succeeded in reducing the hours of adult labour by combination?

Our trade is piece-work, and our hours of labour are regulated more particularly by the time of year; but the Christians rarely work more than 10 hours a day, unless it is an exceptional time of the year, just about the present time, the period between Easter and Whitsuntide. If they had a chance to work an hour overtime, they might do it very likely, but they will not do continuous work of extra hours.

3464. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] I suppose the work that a finisher gets in the Christian houses is more or less regular; he has no more difficulty in getting work one day of the week than he has another; he may not get so much at one time as at another, but it is more or less regular?

Some days in the winter they have to go without work altogether; other days they may get half a day's work; sometimes they get a days work in the week, or two days.

3465. But it is not crowded into any particular two days in the week?

No, it is just as it comes along.

3466. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] Bribery, you have mentioned; that is very common in various trades?

I think it is; I know it is in our trade.

3467. When a man wants to get work he will make presents to the foreman?

That is among the Jews exclusively. I never knew it among the Christians.

3468. You think, if I understand you rightly, that there is no great prospect of combination among the foreigners?

I should be sorry to say that. I have been trying for years to guide them in that way, and we have already got a society numbering 200 or 300, and I have great hope that they will succeed in keeping it going. One of the difficulties with regard to these big Jewish manufacturers is, that if they find the men are getting anything like a combination, they begin to sack them.

3469. The constant flow of immigration would militate against the prospects of a successful society, would it not?

I think it would. There is one thing I should like to mention, if the Committee would permit me; I think myself it would be a good thing if we could check them coming in; and then I think, beyond that, it would be a good thing if it was compulsory that any man working at home, employing any others but his own children, should, under a penalty, register it as a workshop, subject to the Factory Inspector's rules. I would make it incumbent upon him to register if he employed any men at all.

3470. Any beyond his own family?

Yes. I do not want to interfere in a man's own house. A father might naturally teach his children, but if he employed anyone beyond that, he ought to be compelled to register under the Factory and Workshop Inspection.

3471. Earl of *Onslow.*] Would you make him pay any fee?

I should put a penalty on if he did not register.

3472. But any registration fee?

No, I do not think I should like to tax him.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

SOLOMON FRANKS, is called in, and, having been sworn; is Examined, as follows (*his Evidence being interpreted*):

3473. *Chairman.*] WHAT is your trade?
A tailor's presser.

3474. Are you a member of the London Tailors' and Machinists' Society?
Yes.

3475. Are you an official of the society, the secretary, or any other official of it?
No.

3476. Can you give the Committee any evidence about the society?
Yes, I can give some evidence.

3477. The name of the society, you say, is the London Tailors' and Machinists Society; is that composed of Jews or Christians?
Of Jews only. I am one of the committee.

3478. How many members of the society are there?
About 80.

3479. How long has the society been in existence?
About three years.

3480. Have you any idea of the number of Jews employed in the tailoring trade in the East-end of London?
I could not give any idea.

3481. Are there any societies of a similar nature?
There is another branch called the Jewish Branch of the Amalgamated Society of Tailors.

3482. Is this society you are connected with a working men's society, or one of the masters?
Workmen only.

3483. The Committee would be glad to hear anything you have to say?
I have been three years in London, and did not work so hard in any part of the world that I have been in as I do in London. The hours of work in the tailoring establishments in the East-end are 18.

3484. What is your native country?
I was born at Vilna, in Russia.

3485. Did you work as a tailor in Russia?
Yes; and in Roumania as well.

3486. When did you leave Russia?
Three years ago; I came direct to London.

3487. When did you work in Roumania?
I worked in Roumania in 1875. I went from Russia to Roumania, and from Roumania back to Russia, and from Russia I came to London.

3488. Then you have only worked in Russia, in Roumania, and in London?
Yes.

3489. Why did you leave Russia?
The laws are too stringent; there is no liberty.

3490. What hours did you work in Russia?
From 12 to 13 hours in Russia, and the same in Roumania, and in London from 17 to 18, and sometimes more. The work is much easier in Russia and Roumania than it is in London; they do not drive the work so much there as they do here.

3491. Why

3491. Why do you remain in London?
Because there is more freedom in London than there is in any other place; for that reason alone I stay here.

3492. What you complain of is the long hours of work?
Yes, I complain of the long hours.

3493. Are you working yourself now?
I am working for a sweater.

3494. How many men are there in the shop?
Eight persons.

3495. Can you describe the shop?
The dimensions of the shop are these: It is rather long, but narrow and very low. The entrance to the workshop is very dark; the room is very much heated, especially at night. Thursday and Friday we work very hard; Thursdays and Fridays sometimes we work all night.

3496. Why?
I am working on a bespoke trade firm. The bespoke shopkeepers send in their work rather late at the end of the week, and they must have all their work done by Saturday. Sometimes the shopkeeper will send in, say, 30 or 40 garments, but the sweater will not allow us to make the 30 or 40 in the ordinary course, but only allow us to make, say, eight on Monday, and eight on Tuesday, and will keep the remainder to the end of the week, in order to get the work done quickly. The 30 or 40 coats are not sent in at once, but they accumulate up to that number, and then we do a portion of the work on Monday or Tuesday, but what comes in on Wednesdays he keeps, and makes the men work all night on Thursday.

3497. What is the object of that?
The object is to make more profit, because he can squeeze in a lot of work more by working during the night; the shopkeeper wants all the work done by Saturday.

3498. Are you paid by piece-work or day-work?
Day-work.

3499. What do you get for a day's work?
Seven shillings for a day's work when I am at work?

3500. How long is a day's work?
From 15 to 16 hours.

3501. If you work longer than that what wages are you paid?
Sometimes I work three hours over the 16 hours, but will only get a shilling for it. I am not paid in proportion to the ordinary hour's work.

3502. What I understand you to say is, that it is cheaper to the man who employs you to give you two half days consecutively, and then to give you a whole day's work, or even to work you over hours?
Yes, that is his object.

3503. What about the sanitary condition of the shop you work in?
There is one w.c. for the workers and the tenants. On foggy days when the gas has to be alight all day it is very unhealthy. The room is too small for the number of persons employed.

3504. How long have you been in this shop?
Over a year.

3505. Has it ever been inspected by a sanitary inspector, or factory inspector?
No.

3506. Do the people in your society understand the duties of the factory inspector, and what the law is about the matter?

Yes, the members of my society do understand the duties of the factory inspector.

3507. How is it that there are so few members in this society?
Last summer there were 400 members in the society; then they began to talk about helping the trade to ameliorate the condition of the workers, and the members of the society attended meetings, and in consequence of their attending the meetings some of them were discharged, and they were afraid of belonging to the society.

3508. In fact, you say that the men are afraid of combining?
Three persons belonging to the society are employed in the same workshop that I have been employed in, and the employer discharged them, because he said he did not want any society men.

3509. How do you account for the fact that you were not discharged yourself?
As my employer discharged three society men, I being a society man as well, went out with them of my own accord; I did not want to stop in the workshop, because those three men were discharged.

3510. Have you found any difficulty in getting employment since?
I had a difficulty in obtaining employment after that.

3511. Is there great competition to get work among persons that are sweated?
No, there is no competition among the workers, but they are very much oppressed by the sweaters.

3512. You say that three men were discharged out of the workshop you worked in because they belonged to the society?
Yes.

3513. And you also say there is no competition to get work; do you mean that the sweater who owns that shop would have difficulty in getting three men to supply the places of those discharged?
He had no difficulty in getting the workmen, because he engaged the men previous to discharging these three men.

3514. I do not think you fairly understood my question. I understand from you that the men are afraid of combining, because they are afraid of being discharged. It is obvious that they would not be afraid of being discharged unless there were plenty of other men ready to take their places. I asked you whether there were plenty of other men ready to take their places, and I understood you to say, no?
There are men willing and ready to take the places of those who have been discharged.

3515. Then you misunderstood what I meant by asking whether there was competition; to your knowledge, is there much competition from the towns in the provinces; Leeds for instance?
I cannot say about that.

3516. Have you got anything to say about the greener immigration?
A greener could easily obtain some kind of situation, but they have to work very hard, much harder than those who have already been here a good many years.

3517. I want to know whether, in your opinion, these men, the greeners, coming into the trade make it difficult for the workmen in the trade to combine?
In my opinion there is no difference from these greeners coming into the trade, because a greener cannot do the work that an ordinary tailor can do; therefore he cannot reduce the wages of them. When the greeners come in they do work cheaper, but it does not have any effect upon those who have already been in the trade for a couple of years.

3518. In fact you think the greener immigration is doing you no harm?
I cannot see why the workmen should be against the greeners.

3519. It

3519. It was reported in the papers that there was a strike of a number of Jewish tailors at Leeds; if that is true, and if it be successful, would it have any effect upon the Jewish sweaters in London?

I saw that notice in "Lloyd's." If the strike at Leeds were successful it would have some kind of effect in bettering the condition of the workers in London, only in the slop trade.

3520. Is there anything more you wish to say?

The only thing I have to say is that I object to the long hours of labour; and if something could be done to reduce the hours of labour it would reduce the slack season at the same time. It shortens the lives of the workers by working them very long hours. I do not feel so tired any other day, but only those days when I work very long hours.

3521. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] Who asked you to give evidence here to-day?

The Secretary of the London Tailors' and Machinists' Society. I received this post-card: "Thursday, 14½, Scarborough-street, Goodman's Fields. Dear Sir,—I have just received a communication from the House of Lords, who desire your attendance to-morrow at 12 o'clock. Yours truly, *W. Woolf.*"

3522. Are you still at work, or out of work?

I am in work.

3523. Are you afraid that if your evidence to-day is published it will cause any trouble to you by offending your employer?

I am not afraid, because I am a practical tailor myself; but other Witnesses who have attended here will have some trouble before they get situations, or the sweaters might do some harm to them.

3524. Supposing one of the men who worked with you at that other shop where three men were discharged, gave evidence here, would it be likely he would keep his situation if he gave evidence of the long hours and the heat of the room?

They would be discharged from employment if they gave evidence.

3525. Have you any objection to your evidence being published which you have given to-day?

I am not afraid of my evidence being published.

3526. Why do you think there will be no objection to your evidence on the part of your employer?

I am not afraid of the employer; if I am discharged I can get another one, because I am a practical tailor, but I am afraid on behalf of the others.

3527. You are a superior workman, and therefore are pretty sure of getting a place?

Yes.

3528. Lord *Monkswell.*] How many hours a week did you work abroad; in Russia, for instance?

Seventy-two.

3529. Was there work regular all round the year?

There was very seldom a slack season.

3530. What in Roumania?

In Roumania I worked the same number of hours, but sometimes I worked two or three hours more during the week.

3531. As to the greeners I understand you to say that you cannot understand why the workers should be against the greeners; but is it your opinion that the workers, as a matter of fact, are against the greeners?

I find one or two persons speaking about the greeners, but I hear no general complaints from the workers about these greeners.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

A. J. FELZ, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

3532. *Chairman.*] ARE you a member of the same society as the last Witness?
Yes.

3533. Are you a member of the committee also?
No.

3534. And you are a tailor by trade?
A machinist.

3535. Have you heard the evidence given by the last Witness?
Part of it.

3536. Would you give the Committee any information that you wish; you need not go over the same ground as the last Witness, as far as you agree with what he asked; will you tell the Committee anything new?
I have worked in a workshop lately where the w.c. is actually in the workshop, and the washing clothes are hung in the workshop to dry.

3537. Do you mean that the w.c. is in the workshop without any division at all?
It is partly divided by a partition.

3538. Can you give the name of the shop you have worked in?
Yes; Marks Fromberg, 11, Princess-street, Spitalfields.

3539. Are you working there now?
No; I left four weeks ago.

3540. How many men were employed in this place?
Nine men.

3541. Any women?
About 10 or 11, I think.

3542. Any children, girls?
No children at all.

3543. Ten or eleven women and nine men?
Yes.

3544. Working together in this workshop?
Yes.

3545. And you say that the clothes were hung up in the room?
Were hung up to dry in the workshop.

3546. What clothes?
The washing.

3547. The washing of the house?
Of the house.

3548. Earl of *Onslow.*] It is a yard, is it not, that has been covered over with glass?
Yes, that is it.

3549. *Chairman.*] Do you know how large it is?
I could not say how large it is.

3550. What you complain of is the position of this w.c.
Yes; and the long hours we worked.

3551. How long hours were you accustomed to work there?

We

We were accustomed to work there 13 hours, and if we worked half a day he forced us to work seven hours for half a day.

3552. How long were you in that shop?
Three months.

3553. Was the place visited by the Factory Inspector?
It was visited by the Factory Inspector since I have been there.

3554. Have you anything else to complain of?
The reason why we have very little work one part of the year is because some manufacturers do not care about having the work made before the time so as to have it in time, because they know very well that any part of the year if they want vests and coats they can get them on the shortest notice, because they know these sweaters will take the coats and force the workpeople to work all night.

3555. But what advantage is that to the manufacturer?
It gives him the interest of his money, instead of paying out the money, and I know this as a fact where I work now; I used to work there before, that was in last November; we were obliged to work from Thursday morning at eight o'clock till Friday evening at six o'clock, and we only had an interval on Thursday for the dinner hour, one hour, and during the night about an hour and a half or two hours' sleep on the machine table.

3556. Did that happen often?
No, that has not happened very often; it happened twice last November.

3557. Do you blame your master for that?
Not exactly him, but I blame the lot of them.

3558. I mean the man who employed you; he had an order to do, and he had to do it, I suppose?
He was not forced, but if he would not do it somebody else would have done it; but if all combined and said they would not do it, then they would have to have the work done before the time, and not wait till the last minute.

3559. How do you account for there being so few members in your society, and the difficulty in getting men to combine?
Some are afraid of the employers, at least where I work. The master does not know whether I am a member of this society or not, and then he does not know whether I have come here to give evidence or not; I have made some excuse or other; and that is the reason why I do not care to give my full name to be reported, because he does not know me by the name of Felz. I could not say whether the Factory Inspector has visited that workshop lately; I have only been there four weeks, and the rules are torn away to pieces, and they are so black that they are hardly able to be read; but I am told by the other workmen who have worked there longer that the Factory Inspector has visited it lately. They did not say anything about the rules.

3560. Do the workmen understand English?
Partly.

3561. How long have you been in this country?
About 16 or 17 years.

3562. Always working in the same trade?
During the 16 or 17 years I have been abroad 3½ years.

3563. Where?
In Russia, in Poland.

3564. Is Poland your native country?
Yes.

3565. You came to England, and went back to Poland?
Yes.

3566. Did you go back to work as a tailor in Poland?

 I went

I went at the age of 13, and was apprenticed there in the tailoring trade. I served my apprenticeship and then came over to England, and I found it rather difficult in the needlework, and I took to the machine-work. I was not quick enough for the tailoring trade altogether.

3567. You preferred remaining here to staying in Poland?
I came here with my parents.

3568. First of all, you mean?
Yes.

3569. And then you went back?
With my parents as well.

3570. And came back to this country with your parents also?
Yes.

3571. Earl of *Onslow.*] One or two questions about this privy in the yard. Do you say that the Factory Inspector inspected the factory while you were there?
Yes.

3572. How long ago was that?
About two months or more; I could not say exactly.

3573. Did he not make any remarks on this privy accommodation?
No he did not make any remark at all.

3574. Do you think he saw it?
He inspected it, counted the hands, counted the gas-lights, inspected the w.c., and everything.

3575. It is close to the stove, is it not?
Yes, just behind the stove.

3576. Is the result of its being in the workroom where there are men and women, that the women do not make use of it?
That I could not say.

3577. Do you mean that the women do use it?
They use it sometimes.

3578. Earl of *Derby.*] In your business, supposing the employer took offence at what any man had said or done and discharged him, would he find any difficulty in getting others to take his place?
No, he would not find any difficulty, because the man that came to offer to work for him would not know why the other man was discharged.

3579. But, as a matter of fact the supply of labour in your trade is greater than the demand; is not that so; there are more workmen in your business than can find employment?
Yes.

3580. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] On the occasion of those very long spells of work which you have mentioned, could the employer have got in more men so as to reduce the hours; could he have got more men without overcrowding the shop too much?
Very likely he could, but he did not have room enough for them; and then in the part of the year when that took place he would find it very likely a difficulty; anybody when he had work in hand just for these few weeks would be looking for men.

3581. It would be difficult for him to find extra men at short notice?
It would.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR.

11*th May* 1888.

MR. LEWIS LYONS, having been re-called; is further Examined, as follows:

3582. *Chairman.*] You said on a former occasion, I think, that the sweating system existed also in the West End of London?
Yes.

3583. And that you would be able to give some evidence to the Committee on that subject?
Yes. Besides working in some of the shops in the West End myself, I have made a thorough investigation of some of the sweaters and of the workers of the West End, and I find that there is a large number of sweating dens in the West End, and a large number of bespoke shops send their trade down to some of the sweating dens in the East End of London. I will first commence by saying that the Civil Service Supply Association employ sweaters. One particular man is a man of the name of Mr. Marks, No. 7, Rose-street, West End. This sweater employs about 30 or 40 hands; he gives them one-half of the price paid to him by the Civil Service Association. The entrance to this den is through some kind of shed, or stable, which is very dirty. The staircase is very narrow, leading to the second floor, which is the den. At the bottom of the stairs there is the w.c., used for the whole household. If any person were to come down the stairs he would have to wait until the person who was inside the w.c. closed the door of the w.c., so narrow are the stairs, and so close is the w.c. next to the staircase. In a case of fire, the man inside, or the person inside the w.c., would have a great difficulty in getting out; and the consequence of that would be that the person would be suffocated. The workers work very long hours, although they receive a half of what the sweater gets. It is not because the sweater's victims want to work long hours, but because the sweater wants to make more profit out of the workers, consequently he forces them to work a large number of hours. The hours at that place are from 17 to 18, and they work on very good coats. I should like any of your Lordships to visit this place. I have visited the place myself, and had it not been that I have missed the artist, I should have brought a sketch with me here this afternoon.

3584. Where is Rose-street?
Opposite Tottenham Court-road. I do not know the neighbourhood very well; it is opposite Tottenham Court-road, I think, or somewhere near that place. There is a brass-plate outside the door, and the entrance, as I said before, is through a shed or some kind of stable (I do not know what it is used for). The labour in that place is also sub-divided, as in the slop trade. I should like to mention that although the Civil Service Association, and other bespoke shops, pay a good price to the sweaters for their garments to be made, yet the sweaters sub-divide the labour amongst their hands, the same as they do in the slop trade; and in many cases the bespoke trade is made just as bad as the slop trade is. Consequently the public are deceived with regard to the workmanship, although they pay a very good price for it; that is because the sweater does not take any pride in his work, nor does the workman; because the hours of labour are so long, and the wages paid to them are so low, that they only want to get the work out of their hands as quick as they possibly can. As an instance, a coat is fitted up by the employer, and is handed over to the machine hand. This machine hand, I may say in the bespoke trade, works by the piece, yet he has to do a quantity of work in order to obtain say, 6 *s.* or 7 *s.* per day, as was stated by Miss Potter. The machine hand does his work and then throws it over to the presser to press open the seams. Now the presser does not understand the part of the machine work, consequently he does not know whether there is any fault in the machine work. The presser having done his part, throws it over to the baster, and if the thing is not done so well as it ought to be, the baster does not care, because the sweater wants his work done very quickly, and it must be done too. The baster

then turns it over again to the machine hand, and the machine hand does not understand any part of the basting, consequently if there is anything wrong in the basting, the machine hand does not care. And so it goes right round from one hand to the other. One does not know the particular branch of the work that is done by another man, consequently the public is deceived in this class of workmanship, although they pay a very good price. In some cases the shopkeepers and their foreman are aware of this sub-division of labour, and in some cases they are not, but it is the same with the shopkeeper as it is with the sweater; it is all a question of profit with him, and not a question of the pride he should take in his work. I shall now mention another case, and that is Nicoll's, in Regent-street; there is a very peculiar system of work there. Their bespoke work is done inside on the premises, but their stock trade is sent down to the East End sweaters' dens. One sweater by the name of Smith lives at Prescott Street, and the other sweater by the name of Smith lives in the New Road.

3585. Both sweaters named Smith?

Both sweaters named Smith. They do the stock trade. The prices paid for the stock trade are much higher than in any other shop in London, and the labour is subdivided in that stock trade (although Nicoll's pay a higher price), in the same way as the labour is subdivided in a garment made for a shilling or so. I should like to mention that this Smith last year paid a fine of 25 *l.* for neglect of the Factory law.

3586. You have mentioned two Smiths; which Smith?

Smith in Prescott-street. I should like to state that, at Nicoll's, the work is done inside the premises, the work is given out to sweaters inside, the same as it is outside. At the back of the premises, in Regent-street, that is Warwick-street, there is a row of houses; I believe there are three (three or four). In each house there are about eight workshops; they were formerly dwelling-rooms, but they have been thrown one into another, and made shops of. These workshops are let out to sweaters by Nicoll, and Nicoll charges these sweaters rent; and he gives the bespoke work to the sweaters on the premises, and the same subdivision of labour takes place there as it would take place if the sweater had been off the premises. So there is no difference whether the sweater is inside the premises or off; but, of course, it is in order that the work may get the name that it is done inside Nicoll's premises. For the eight workshops there are two w.c.'s, and in each workshop there might be between 20 and 30 hands. The w.c.'s for the males is right below the house, that is in the cellar; the w.c.'s for the females is in the centre of the house; and there are only those two for the whole eight rooms. The hours of labour, at these sweaters' shops (I can call them nothing else, they are built by Nicoll, and he charges them a rent, and the public are deceived, the same as they would be if the men were off the premises), for the men are from seven to nine, and the average wage of these men would not be 18 *s.* per week; and I may say that, though they are divisionalists, yet they are practical men. For instance, the machine-hand would be a practical machine-hand, and the baster or presser would be a practical man also.

3587. What do you mean by a "practical" baster?

One man who understands basting thoroughly; while the presser would be a man who can press under and can press off frock-coats, jackets, morning coats, &c. An unskilled presser or an inexperienced presser would only be able to press off jackets, but not frock-coats. There is a great art in pressing off a frock-coat, and there is also a great art in machine work in that particular branch.

3588. I know the difference between the two, as I have worked on both; but yet there is not as much time allowed for this bespoke machinery as one would like to have. I also have brought with me a witness who has worked in these West End shops, who could bear out my statement. I have a great deal more to say about these sweating dens, both in the East and West End. I am giving these two cases, as I find they are two cases of its being practised by large

large places, that is Nicoll and the Civil Service Association; because I believe that the public who patronise these two places are not aware of these sweating dens or of this sweating system as they practice it; and if the public were made acquainted with these sort of things, I believe they could stop it themselves.

3589. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] Do you imply that the Civil Service Association are responsible. You represented to us that they paid a good price for their work, but that those to whom they let it out employed the sweating system: that meant, I suppose, that the Civil Service Association are not responsible, because they do not know how the work is done?

I am aware that they do know, and they know the unsanitary conditions under which the work is carried on. They are responsible for it, and for the workers receiving lower wages, becaus they know they are giving the work to the sweaters. In this particular case the man is not a tailor himself; he gets the divisionalists to do the work; but it passes through his hands; and while I do not say that the company itself is responsible, I do say that the managers, or the foremen whom the Civil Service Association employ, are responsible for the work that is being made in this unsanitary place; and I am sure they are also responsible for the low wages that these men receive, because they know the price they pay, and I believe they know the number of hours that these men work, and it is their duty to look after the safety of the workers, the same as they do in the interests of the public. As I said before, I mention these two cases first, because the public are not aware that this thing does exist, and if they were they could easily alter it by saying that they will not patronise the place. But this thing is carried on, and what I should say to Nicoll is: "Here are the men on your own premises, dispense with the middleman sweater, because if he was dispensed with and you came in contact with the workers directly, they would be able to work shorter hours, and they would have better sanitation"; because as the workshop is let out to the sweater, it takes all responsibility off Nicoll altogether, and the whole responsibility is thrown on this middleman sweater; and should any complaint be made to Nicoll, he says: "I have nothing to do with it. Here is the man I give the work to, and he pays me for the loan of this room."

3590. Earl of *Onslow.*] Do you say, as a fact, that Messrs. Nicoll do throw all responsibility off themselves on to the sweater?

I say it is so as a fact, because the sweater pays the rent; and in a City house I know where the sweater is employed inside and pays the rent, the responsibility of the factory laws is thrown on the sweater.

3591. *Chairman.*] I suppose you do not mean to say that you know of your own knowledge that Nicolls have thrown the responsibility on the sweater, but what you mean is that you assume that they would under the circumstances of the case?

It is so, because they throw all responsibility on this man; they have nothing at all to do with the workers; they charge the rent to this man, and give him the work; they build up their premises, and hire them out so as to get the name that the work is done inside the premises instead of off the premises.

3592. I quite understand all that, but I want to be clear as to your meaning, and that you are not saying what you do not intend to say. I understand you to say that the responsibility is upon the sweater, and not upon Nicolls?

Yes.

3593. But what you did say is that Nicolls throws the responsibility upon the sweater?

I say so now, because by his employing this sweater, and charging him rent, and not coming into contact with the workers (who are working from seven till nine), as a matter of fact he throws all responsibility on to the sweater. I have worked in a similar place; and instead of the firm signing its name to the abstract of rules that is given to it by Mr. Lakeman, or any Factory Inspector, the sweater signs his name on these factory rules. That is where I take it that he throws all responsibility on to the sweater, because the sweater

signs his name instead of Nicoll himself; and if your Lordships visit these places, if there are rules at all (the workers tell me in some places they have no rules at all), although there are a large number of worker's working in the place, you will find that the sweater's name is signed on these rules instead of Nicolls. Consequently it is throwing the responsibility of Nicoll on to the sweater. I have taken these two cases first, because of their being two important places, and I thought they should be made known to your Lordships. Then I have a large number of other persons who take work from the West End into the East End sweating dens, and they work from 17 to 18 hours. There is one sweating den in the Commercial-road where the sweater works for a place in the City, of the name of Whiffin; he also works for a number of bespoke shops at Greenwich, and at Peckham. The work is taken from Greenwich and Peckham to the sweating den in the Commercial-road, although there are a large number of tailors in that neighbourhood who could very well do the work; but this sweater, knowing that he can work by the sub-division of labour, takes the work at a much lower rate than a man at Greenwich or Peckham would do from this same shop.

3594. Earl of *Onslow.*] Has not the rent in Peckham and the City, compared with the East End, something to do with it?

No; it is because the shopkeepers know they can get these people to do the work cheaper, because they can get these people to work much longer hours. I have passed by the places at eleven at night, and they are still at work in it, and in some cases the women, and in most cases the men on Thursday night all night. Englishmen would not do that. The shopkeepers know that they can work the people these long hours, and they give it to them. The public receive no advantage, because no reduction is made to the public. This den is in a most unsanitary condition, and it is also a kind of a yard; there is a skylight, the same as there would be at Fromberg's, and the light required for the work is altogether suspended; the work cannot be turned out as it should be done because there is no light for them to do their work in.

3595. *Chairman.*] No light on a level with the machines you mean; you explained to the Committee in your former evidence the difficulty you had about the light?

Yes; consequently the work cannot be turned out as it should be done. The workshop is a very dirty one; and the public does not know of these things. Now there is a man of the name of Bloom, who lives in Holborn (I am speaking of bespoke work), and he works for Kino's. Now there is also a sub-division in that trade, the same as there would be in the slop trade, and the men work a large number of hours, and the average wages of these men would be in this workshop from 15 *s.* to 16 *s.* I have spoken to a man working in that place, and he said he would be glad if he could receive 25 *s.* a week all the year round, though he was a practical tailor; and on many occasions he was compelled to work late at night because the sweater wanted the work done. He says "I must get as much profit as I can, and if you do not care to work these number of hours you must go." Besides Nicoll's shop, all the other dens in the bespoke shops are dwelling rooms; and they were never intended for workshops; there are ten or twelve persons in some cases working in these dens, which are not fit for more than five or six; and the number of gas-lights are exactly the same as what they are in the East End slop trade; and altogether the sanitary conditions are bad; and, of course, the restrictions I would propose there would be same as what I have stated before. The machine hands in the bespoke trade work by the piece, and supposing they want to make a garment or two less, so as to leave off an hour or so earlier, the employer will not allow them, because the machine hand must work in with the other divisionalists; otherwise they would have to leave off at the same time as the machine hands did, consequently the sweater who wants to have his garments made in order to make his profit, compels this machine hand to stay against his wish, although he says, as they have said (because we continually receive complaints from these victims who belong to this society), that he is willing to earn less one day, that the work should be distributed throughout the week. They get no advantage by working very hard for three days than for three days being idle; and, therefore,

fore, they are willing to receive a less portion one day so as to make up it for the next. But it is not agreeable to the sweater, because he wants the same profit in three days as he would get out of six. The reason he works three instead of six is, because, in that way, there are less expenses to the sweater, though he could well afford to bear those expenses, and the shopkeeper pays tolerably good prices to the sweater. If the sweater could only be done away with, the workers, instead of working 15 and 16 hours, could very well, in my opinion, work 10. I have made this calculation with other persons, and we have come to the conclusion that the work done in these sweating dens in 16 hours could very well be done in 10 hours, and throughout the year the wages would average exactly the same; and we cannot see why, in the bespoke trade, these victims should suffer the same as they do in the slop trade; there may be some excuse in the slop trade, but their can be no excuse in the bespoke trade. That is why I said to the Committee that I was prepared to give evidence that the sweating was done in the bespoke trade, though there is no occasion for it whatever, of course.

3596. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Why do you say that there is no occasion for it; does not it in the bespoke trade depend upon the orders given by the public?

Yes; but it is not necessary that those should pass through the sweater. Now in the case of Poole's, Poole employs his workpeople on the premises. Now, although Poole's is a very good shop, and the customers pay a very good price, yet if Poole can dispense with this middleman sweater, so could other shopkeepers dispense with him by employing the workers direct from the firm; but they will not do it because there is an expense attached to it, and they say: "We do not want this expense attached to us; we will throw it on somebody else." And besides, if they had a workshop on their own premises they would have to share the responsibility of these factory laws. Instead of that they close their shops at six or seven o'clock, and they send home their orders to the sweating den at that particular time, and they say, "We must have these things in the morning or to-morrow night." If the sweater would say, "I cannot make it and will not make it by that time," there would be an end to it; but as long as the sweater will take these things, he will compel his workpeople to stay longer hours, and consequently they have to work till very late at night; the shopkeeper closes at six or seven, but these men have to work till eleven or twelve at night, and on Thursday night all night in the East End sweating dens; but in the West End they work Friday night instead of Thursday night.

3597. *Chairman.*] What is the reason for that?

I can give no particular reason, only this, that the East End sweaters are somewhat more orthodox, more religious than the West End sweaters; they want to deliver their work in by Friday night at the latest; they do not want to work Friday night on account of their religious belief; but the West End sweaters are not so orthodox, and consequently they substitute for the Thursday the Friday. The shopkeepers in the West End know that they are doing a wrong, and that their work is done in very unsanitary places, and exactly as Hope Brothers have part of their work done on the premises, and Poole has all his work done on the premises, I can see no reason why other firms or other shops should not have their work done in the same way. Hope Brothers do part of their work on the premises, and I know a machine hand who works there; he works from eight to eight; but they give a large quantity of work off the premises, and the machine hands who work off the premises have to work 16 hours. There is the difference; the men inside the premises are working from eight to eight, and the men working off the premises are working 16 hours a day, If the system works well inside the premises, why not extend it inside the premises? It is a question, of course, of profit.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Martis, 15° *Maii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of DERBY.
Earl of ONSLOW.
Viscount GORDON (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord CLINTON.
Lord KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord MONKSWELL.
Lord Thring.

LORD KENRY (EARL OF DUNRAVEN AND MOUNT-EARL), IN THE CHAIR.

THE REVEREND WILLIAM ADAMSON, having been re-called; is further Examined, as follows:

3598. *Chairman.*] I UNDERSTAND you wish to make some statement to the Committee in reference to the evidence which you gave the other day?

I do. In giving evidence on Thursday the 3rd of May upon competition as affecting prices, and apart altogether from my subsequent evidence on sweating, I adduced incidentally the question of match-box making and laundry work in connection with the Salvation Army. That reference, the only personal one throughout my prolonged examination, was made by me in perfect good faith, without any ulterior motive, and on the basis of long widespread and uncontradicted statements. The Press, no doubt with the best intentions, made misleading and inaccurate abridgements of my evidence, but the Salvation Army, in a letter to "The Times" on Saturday last, the 12th, gave an explicit denial to this general report which I and others had for years understood to be perfectly true, and which, but for that express correction, I would still have continued fully to believe. I am glad to have brought out before the public this authoritative assurance from the Salvation Army, even though it renders it necessary that I should correct my evidence so far as it concerns that body. In doing this, I respectfully call the attention of your Lordships to the following facts, (*a*) that this part of my evidence was confined entirely to competition as affecting prices, apart from direct sweating, (*b*) that throughout my lengthy examination no name or firm was mentioned by me, and (*c*) that I stated, in answer to one of your Lordships at the commencement of that examination, that my evidence would be based upon personal knowledge, and on communications made to me in one form and another as a clergyman of the Church of England during the last 18 years in East London. This is the statement I desire to make.

3599. That is all you wish to say?

Yes.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. WILLIAM PARNELL, having been re-called; is further Examined, as follows:

3600. *Chairman.*] I UNDERSTAND you wish to make some correction?

I do not know whether it is quite a correction in my evidence, or a correction in the interpretation of what I said. I wished, when I gave evidence last time, to give your Lordships to understand the difference between the work made by a

 respectable

respectable firm like Messrs. Gillow, and the work made in a sub-contractor's shop; but for some reason or other I have been reported to have said that if Messrs. Gillow got an order it would be made in a sub-contractor's shop.

3601. Perhaps I had better read to you exactly what you did say on that point; what you did say is this: "Whereas now a firm like Messrs. Gillow, for instance, will receive an order, and it will probably be made in some sub-contractor's shop. If Messrs. Gillow made it themselves, they would have a large stock of dry seasoned timber to fall back on to manufacture the article from. The sub-contractor, more than probably, has not anything like a stock at all; the wood is brought direct from the timber yard and used at once." I think that is the material part?

What I wanted to say was: "If Messrs. Gillow receive an order, and if it should be made," and so on. That is what I meant to convey; not that Messrs. Gillow were in the habit of putting out their orders to sub-contractors.

3602. You meant to put a suppositious case, in fact?

Quite so; that is all I wish to say.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. LEWIS LYONS, having been re-called; is further Examined, as follows:

3603. *Chairman.*] Will you continue the statement you were making the other day?

Yes. Respecting the West End sweating, Mr. Whiteley, the Universal Provider of Westbourne Grove, employs sweaters; Mr. Benjamin, of No. 4 Bolton-road, Notting Hill, is one of his sweaters, he does the bespoke work; some of the stock trade will be given to him at a less sum than would be given to some of those working on the premises. He has those working on the premises, and also sweaters, and he would give to the sweaters a less sum than what he would give to those working on the premises, because the sweater must work longer hours, which those inside will not, because they belong to the Amalgamated Society of Tailors. About two years ago the secretary of one of the West End branches of the Amalgamated Society of Tailors sent a letter to the manager of Whiteley's respecting this matter, and it did not receive any reply; and so the sweating at Whiteley's still continues. In connection with Whiteley's there is also a foreman by the name of Vetter; he gives out large quantities of trousers to his son, off the premises, who employs a large number of females at a very low figure, to do the work. The work is given out to this son, but not in the name of the son, but in the wife's name, and the name of the wife is Hannah. That is done in order that the firm should not detect that this is the son of the foreman. The next case is S. A. Kino, of Westbourne Grove, he employs a sweater by the name of Leon, who resides at All Saints-road, Westbourne Park; as a blind to the public, and in order that they may be deceived, he employs a sweater, on the premises, by the name of DeLange, who has three machines. In connection with this workshop, myself and a member of the Amalgamated Society of Tailors passed these premises at a quarter to 11 last night, and the people were still at work. The room was lit up, and the top window was down about four inches, which was meant for ventilation. The bottom window was of stained glass, to prevent passers-by noticing what was going on; but being in the trade, and of course understanding the tricks of the sweaters, we noticed by close observation, that by the twisting of the head it was that of a female; we could see that distinctly. Of course, being in the shade, we closely observed whether it was the head of a female or a man, and we discovered that it was the head of a female.

3604. What shop are you alluding to?

I mention this as the case of S. A. Kino, of Westbourne Grove. We tried to gain an entry, if possible, to speak to the sweater, but every door leading to the premises was barred with iron railings. And Mr. Cash, in Oxford-street, also employs sweaters, one by the name of Prouse, who resides at No. 6, Paddington-street,

street West; he employs both male and female, and there are two w.c.'s. The Junior Army and Navy Stores, York House, Regent-street, employ a sweater by the name of Jacobs. They do the work by machine and sub divide the labour, and, as I explained on a previous occasion, in the slop trade, the Junior Army and Navy Stores pay them a very good price for their garments, but I do not know whether they are aware of the sub-division of labour by which the public are deceived. Now I come to the East End sweating respecting the bespoke trade. Mr. White, in Blackheath-road, employs a sweater by the name of Mr. Solomon, of No. 72, Settle-street, Commercial-road East. He makes morning and frock coats at the rates of 9 *s.* and 10 *s.* each. Two years ago these same garments were paid at the rate of 17 *s.*; and in consequence of this sweater making the garments at a reduced wage, by subdividing the labour, working longer hours, and introducing cheap female labour, the tailor who was previously employed, an Irishman, and who got the 17 *s.*, who is not employed at this shop any longer, and is thrown out of the market. The Civil Service Association employs a Mr. Smith, of 55, Great Prestcott street, who has six machines at work. A man by the name of Mr. Abraham, of No. 16, Mulberry-street, works for this Mr. Smith, and he has to come in to work very early in the morning, and to work till late at night. The sanitary condition of this place is very bad.

3605. What do you mean by "very early"?

Half-past six or seven, sometimes earlier. I may mention, for instance, that the Jewish holydays commence this evening, and they want to clear their work in by this evening, and the men would have to come in, therefore, at five o'clock in the morning. When I came here last Friday I had about eight orders to make, and I went in at half-past five to work in order to get away; otherwise things could not get done. Charles Baker, of Euston-road, employs a sweater by the name of Harris Friendy, who lives at 133, Oxford-street; he has two machines at work, and sub-divides the labour as in slop-making. Hyam's, in Oxford-street (these are all bespoke shops), employs Abraham Hofinberg, of No. 10, Little Portland-street, Poland-street; he has two machines at work. Joseph Brothers, of No. 522, Kingsland-road, employs a Mr. Lazarus, of 39, Spellman-street; a very small room is used as a workshop, and the sanitary conditions are very bad; sometimes the washing will be hung up in the workshop to dry, and of course it will cause a great annoyance to the workers, and should they complain they are instantly dismissed. A man by the name of Samuel Levy, a workman, who lives at No. 15, Everard-street, worked for a sweater by the name of Mr. Lewis, of No. 90, Princess-street, Spitalfields; he does bespoke work. This man came to work at eight in the morning and worked until eleven o'clock at night, and sometimes until one the following morning, and when he asked the sweater for over-time he had a row with him, and threw him down the stairs, and would not pay him. Mr. Massey, shopkeeper, of Queen's-road, Peckham, employs a Mr. Walter, of the Commercial-road, and he works six machines. It is a most horrible den to work in. The females work to nine and half-past nine at night; I have seen them myself come out of that place; and the men till ten o'clock or eleven o'clock at night, and the wages are very low. We have a number of these men come to our society, and they continually complain to our secretary, and ask him to see if nothing can be done for them. I had a man come to me on Sunday evening, a man who does military work, and he asked me to mention it to your Lordships; he says he will be willing to give me the address; and then I will give you this address, and show any one of your Lordships the sweating dens in which the military clothing is made. He has worked in this place himself, and is willing to give me the address. Hope Brothers, whom I mentioned in my last evidence, employ a Mr. Marks, of No. 8, Church-street, Spitalfields; he does bespoke work and stock work. I should like to mention that in the case of Poole's, up till recently (what I mean by recently would be about a month or two ago) they did employ outdoor sweaters, but Mr. Poole himself was not aware of it, though the foreman was, but the men working in that firm are members of the Amalgamated Tailors, and they petitioned Mr. Poole, and he said, "I will take it into consideration," which he did, and I do not

not think he is giving the work out to sweaters now; at least, he has instructed the foreman not to do so any longer, and if all these men I have mentioned would do the same it would be a great assistance not only to the workers but also to the public, because I think that the public should be made aware of the truth. When they pay a good price for their garments they do not want bad workmanship, and they want their work made in sanitary places; and it is very often the case that a disease breaks out in a family, and the doctors are perplexed in discovering the origin of that disease. Take, for instance, the man in Spellman-street: there is only a small den there, and the washing is hung up in the rooms. Well, certainly the garments are most unsanitary when they reach the shop. And, besides, the garments that come from some of these dens where military work is made are worn by the soldiers, and the disease breaks out among them. And not only that, but the workmanship is so bad. I spoke to a soldier who was out in the Zulu war, and he said that when he had to stoop down to fire the trousers split right down; and we actually traced where these things were made, and he says that something should be done to see that the work should not be made in these small dens, and with bad workmanship. I have a few sketches with me, done by Mr. Rochefort, one of the artists of the "Pall Mall Gazette"; he has brought them rather late, he has not left me any time to prepare.

3606. Sketches of what?
Of sweaters' dens.

3607. I am afraid we cannot take sketches in evidence?
I want to produce these sketches, and if your Lordships like to look at them I have no objection to hand them in.

3608. They are not photographs?
They are not photographs; they are sketches.

3609. Lord *Monkswell.*] You saw the man sketch them?
The artist is here himself, if your Lordships like to examine him.

3610. *Chairman.*] If you wish the Committee to see them you can produce them?
I will produce them. In our rounds we have drawn a sketch of a match-box factory as well.

3611. These are sketches of workshops, I understand that you have spoken of?
Yes. I mentioned in my evidence that a Mr. Marks, of Rose-street, had a den, and the entrance was through a stable or yard, and that the w.c. was at the bottom of the staircase, and the staircase a very narrow one, and dirty. When I left this house I immediately went with the artist to this spot to take this sketch, and I have got the sketch with me (*producing a sketch*) anybody coming down stairs with this door of the w.c. open would have to wait till this door was closed; we tried, myself and the artist, to get up stairs, but we could not see our way, so we went away again. This (*producing another sketch*) is a sweater's den in Greenfield-street where bespoke work is made; here are 15 or 16 people working in this one; there (*pointing*) is the fire-place; this (*pointing*) was formerly a yard; there are six rooms in this house, and the rent was 13 *s.* previously, but now the landlord has built this workshop in the yard and taken part of the yard in he charges them 27 *s.* a week.

3612. Is that lit entirely by the skylight?
Yes, skylight only. It is impossible for the number of persons working there to work in these dens, the size of the room is so small.

3613. Earl of *Onslow.*] You mean impossible to work well?
Yes. They charge 14 *s.* for this small workshop (*pointing to a sketch*).

3614. *Chairman.*] The dimensions of the workshop are not given here; do you know what they are?
No, I did not measure them. This (*handing in a sketch*) is a room of a sweater's victim; there are nine persons sleeping and living in that room.

3615. And

3615. And working?

No, they simply live there and sleep there. This (*handing in a sketch*) is a den of a match-box place which we visited in our rounds.

3616. Earl of *Onslow*.] These are all at the East End?

Yes; but that one with the w.c. at the bottom of the stairs is at Rose-street, opposite Tottenham Court-road; I think Shaftesbury Avenue, if I am not mistaken. This (*handing in a sketch*) is a person making fish bags. This (*handing in another sketch*) is a sketch of dealers in clothes; that was taken on Sunday morning. This (*handing in a sketch*) is a large size sketch of a sweating den with persons working inside. There is only one w.c. for that workshop. The hours of labour in this place are from half-past six until about 10 or 11 o'clock at night. That is the den in which the young man I had here on the first occasion was working for a 1 *s.* a day as presser. The artist went in there on Thursday night, and he has taken a sketch of this place. Your Lordships see how closely those persons are packed; there were four or five there sitting; there is hardly room enough for one according to the work that has to be done. In connection with the sweating system in the East End, and the long hours of labour I should like to repeat this fact. Your Lordships are no doubt aware of the great strike now taking place at Leeds; 2,000 Jewish workmen are out on strike. The work from that place is sent down to London, and I have traced the two places to which this work is being sent; it is first sent to a manufacturer and cut out, the same as they would give it to a sweater in Leeds, and this manufacturer in London distributes the work among the sweaters in the East End of London.

3617. *Chairman*.] When you say you have traced it, do you mean that you know the manufacturer?

Yes. It took me about five or six hours to trace the two places; of course by making inquiries from one place to another, I traced the manufacturer, also the sweater. It was only necessary for me to trace one sweater to prove my case. What is the use of us combining, whether in London or in Leeds, when the men here are compelled by the sweaters to work all these number of hours. The persons at Leeds cannot possibly gain their end; and if they do not gain their end there, it will be very hard for us here should we have the necessity to turn out. So you see the necessity of legislation in this matter. The manufacturers are different in this way: they do not want any protection, because their capital protects them; but there is nothing to protect us here. The sweater will take the work from this manufacturer, no doubt, because he wants to do the work, and he compels these people to work. If there is an overstock of work he employs a larger number of hands in the small den. I have only mentioned a few of these bespoke shops, nine; I could go on quoting from my rough notes (which I have not brought with me) hundreds of these bespoke shops in the West End who have given their work out to sweaters. It is not necessary for me to go on producing a number of these names, but just the few that I have mentioned are quite sufficient to prove to your Lordships that sweating is carried on in the bespoke trade, and also to disprove the statement made to you before that sweating is not carried on in the bespoke trade. I also heard Miss Potter say on the last occasion that the persons engaged in the coat trade had nothing to complain of. But it is in the coat trade that we do complain. The largest number of workers work in the coat trade. Seventeen and 18 hours a day at a starvation wage is a thing which we have a right to complain of, and as Miss Potter is not a member of the trade at all, I consider that she has no authority to speak on this subject; because the members have actually sent a resolution to the papers condemning the statements of Miss Potter. I have nothing further to say about this; as I have already proved that several large West End houses give their work out; and if your Lordships like to ask any questions, I shall be happy to answer them.

3618. I understand you to says that the cases you have mentioned where bespoke work is put out to sweaters are not peculiar cases, but that it is very generally done?

Yes, generally done.

3619. You have only mentioned certain ones as instances?
Yes, because I could go on quoting page after page of them.

3620. Where does this bespoke work go to, all that is made in the East End, or made in the West End?
The articles go to the customers who give the orders. Sometimes an order is sent down from the country to a London house. In the case of Poole's, they have a large number of customers all over the country, and they have got the customer's measure, and the customers simply send up their statement that they want a suit of clothes, and they have already got their measure. It is done in other places in the same way.

3621. What you mean by bespoke work is orders by individuals?
Orders by individuals; that is the bespoke work. Of course, there is an order given by some of the City houses to a slop manufacturer to get them a lot of dusters made, or racing coats, something of that sort; but we do not call that bespoke trade; we simply call that a slop order. Where some of the firms employ sweaters on their own premises, that is simply done as a blind to tell the public, "We have work done on the premises."

3622. You have alluded once or twice to military work, but there has been no evidence before the Committee as to any military work being put out to work?
This man, who spoke to me on Sunday night, was willing to give me the address where this military work is made, and he wanted me to take your Lordships round to this particular place.

3623. You yourself have got no information to give the Committee on that point?
Not on that point, with the exception of the coat that I brought round here.

3624. That was a volunteer coat?
That was a volunteer coat. They are very particular in the case of Hebbert and Company, in the Bethnal Green-road; he does the military coats as well, but he has also got contracts for the railway work. He used to give out the military work, but since this inquiry he is doing the military work at the premises, but is giving all the railway work out; and this railway work is made in sweating dens, and disease is brought about in the same way. Railway men are as good human beings as soldiers, and I do not see why disease should be allowed to be brought round among them by these garments.

3625. When you say that he used to put out the military work; how do you know he used to do so?
Because I know two or three persons who told me they make them. Females make the trousers; I have the address of one in my book who told me so.

3026. When you say that a certain firm used to put out the military work, you are not saying so of your own knowledge, but from information you received from other persons?
And then I went to the place to see if it was true myself. If I receive any information of that kind, I go and sift it to see whether it is true or whether the place exists. I went to this particular place, and I found the woman and spoke to her, and have got her address. I asked her whether she would be willing to come, but she was not, being afraid of being discharged.

3627. Did you find her doing military work?
Yes.

3628. What kind of military work?
Trousers, with red stripes by the side.

3628. Are you sure they were soldier's trousers?
Yes, I am sure they were soldier's trousers.

3630. Not volunteer trousers?
No, I do not think they were volunteer trousers. I know the difference between

between the two. I have machined Volunteer trousers myself and also military trousers.

3631. Lord *Sandhurst.*] What colour were they?
Dark blue, indigo colour; something like that. It is not altogether black; I cannot describe the exact colour, but a kind of indigo.

3632. With a stripe?
A red stripe.

3633. *Chairman.*] What is this Society of Amalgamated Tailors of which you have spoken?
A society that has been existing for a large number of years; they have got about 300 branches throughout England, Ireland, and Wales; I do not think they have got any in Scotland; they have an amalgamation themselves there.

3634. Is it a Jewish society?
No; they have Jewish branches as well.

3635. Are these men who have gone out on strike at Leeds members of the society?
No, they have got a society of their own, and they have sent down to two or three Hebrew newspapers in London, asking them to raise a subscription, to be sent up to Leeds. We are trying to make a collection in our place to be sent down, but I do not suppose we will get much, because we are poor ourselves.

3636. You spoke of the great difficulties in the way of successful combination on account of the fact that if these men go out on strike in Leeds, the work is all sent to be done in London?
Not all.

3637. A great portion of it?
Yes.

3638. And that, therefore, combination breaks down; but if this Amalgamated Tailors' Society has branches all over the country, does not that enable you to meet that difficulty?
Not at all, because these men who work for the sweaters do not belong to the Amalgamated Tailors. There are three branches of Amalgamated Tailors in the East End; the German branch, composed of trousers and waistcoat makers; then there is the East London branch, whose members do the bespoke work; and then there is the Jewish branch, whose members do the slop work, but they number very few, I think about 80. What are 80 men between 10,000 or 12,000 in the East End. And the reason why they will not belong to it, or cannot belong to it is, because they are intimidated by these sweaters.

3639. I suppose the sweater would not know whether the things really came from Leeds, or where they came from?
The sweater would, because the labels are different, and the cut is different. There is a cut of 10 and 20; I mean by a "cut" of 20 that there are 20 garments cut at once, and that is how we know.

3640. You mean that you would know an order that came from Leeds?
Immediately, or from any other place. We should know the difference; the cut in London is different from what it is in Leeds. When I got that information about that coat I began to trace it; I asked the workmen inside the place to get me a label, but the sweaters are alive to this, and they would not allow the labels to remain in the bundles, but took them away so that the men should not find out what the thing is; but if I get hold of a label I can trace the firm sending it down, and if I was down at Leeds myself, I should probably discover the firm; but being in London you cannot communicate so well about these things as you can by being down there yourself.

3641. Earl of *Derby.*] Why should it be an object with the firm that it should not be known from whence these orders come; that it should not be known that they came from them?

I do not know their object in keeping that a secret, unless it is to assist each other in case of a strike. In London they do the very same thing. Many years ago there was a great strike in London, and the work was sent to the Provinces.

3642. Lord *Clinton*.] You complained of the work being sent from Leeds to London in consequence of the strike at Leeds, and you said that some legislation ought to interfere with it?

Not for the East End only, but for the whole lot.

3643. What sort of legislation do you think will be of any use?

Such as I mentioned in my suggestions on the first occasion of my giving evidence, that is, a law to prohibit long hours, and no workshop to be opened until it has been registered.

3644. But I mean to prevent work being sent to London from Leeds, for instance?

That would prevent that work being sent to London. The reason that it is sent to London is because they work longer hours here; but if the London men worked shorter hours there would be no advantage in sending it down here.

3645. They are striking against the long hours in Leeds, are they?

Yes; there are not so many small dens there, and the workshops are much larger than they are in London, and they are only striking against the hours there, while we have to strike against the middleman and everything else. In connection with the sweating system I should like to mention that Mr. William Thompson, barrister-at-law, wrote a story called the "Sweater's Victim," and he describes there a case of prostitution with a sweater. I do not know his grounds for doing so, but in his book he describes a case where a sweater seduced a girl.

3646. Do you wish to put that in?

I wish to put that as a statement that if your Lordships would like to call the author of this book; he could no doubt from his notes describe to your Lordships who this man was.

3647. You wish to suggest that somebody should be called to give evidence?

To give evidence on this particular case.

3648. Passing from that, you said just now that some of the firms paid better prices than others; I think you mentioned one of the Stores as paying very good prices; do you mean that there is much variation between the prices which different firms pay to the sweaters who take their work?

Yes; if a sweater has more machines and has more hands they pay him a less price. It is a technical thing which ought to be described. Supposing there is one machine, and this one machine could turn out or machine five garments, if there were two machines you would probably think they could turn out 10 garments; but instead of that they turn out 12 garments. And if there were three machines you would naturally believe they would turn out 15 garments between the three; instead of that they turn out 20. It is because the labour in that machine work is subdivided, so that a man becomes a specialist, and he can do the work much quicker, instead of going from one part to the other they make them up in a less labour time, and they know this.

3649. The larger the shop the cheaper they can do the work, you mean?

Yes, it is a purely economical thing, which we object to altogether.

3650. That is not what I meant. I asked you whether some firms paid a better price for the same kind of work than other firms do?

Yes, they do that.

3651. Do they not all get it done as cheaply as they can?

Yes, they do; it all depends upon the season.

3652. You said that the Civil Service or the Army and Navy Stores (I forget which) paid a very good price?

To the sweater. I did not give the difference in the price between the two Stores;

Stores; I gave the price as being paid by the Civil Service or the Army and Navy Stores to the sweater. I said they gave a good price to the sweater.

3653. Do you mean that they give a better price to the sweater than other establishments do?

No; they give a good price to the sweater, but the sweater reduces that price to the worker. Although the Army and Navy and Civil Service pay a good price to the sweater for making their garments the workers have nothing out of it.

3654. You do not mean that they pay any more to the sweater than any other firm would pay?

That all depends upon the season; sometimes they might advance a sixpence or a shilling, but for the same class of goods they would give about the same.

3655. They do not pay any more than they need pay?

No; they will try and cut it down as cheap as they can on account of competition.

3656. Now, with regard to this military work which you say is done at these places, is that paid for at the same rate as ordinary work, or at a better price?

Much less. In the case of Hebbert's he employs a large number of foreigners and pays them a very low wage indeed, much lower than they would receive from the sweater; but the work is a little more regular there, and they depend upon it. I have brought with me a Hebrew labour paper, and there is a paragraph in this Hebrew labour paper relating to a man who worked for Mr. King; I do not think it is the same thing as Hebbert's, but the paragraph describes it as the same thing. This man received a shilling a day (of course, that is a starvation wage), and the man had a wife to keep out of that; the consequence was that he became ill and he died last week in the hospital. The verdict of the doctors was starvation.

3657. What is this man's name?

I do not know whether they give the name here, but I could ascertain the name from the editor (*the Witness refers*). It does not give the name here; it says a married man. I could ascertain the name if your Lordships would require it. The verdict upon this man by the doctors was starvation. Of course, he naturally would die of starvation on a shilling a day. If your Lordships would wait outside this firm, providing this evidence is not made public by this afternoon, you will find that a large number of these foreigners come out of this firm, and you could ask them the question, and they would tell you horrible stories about the firm inside. They tell me these things.

3658. Earl of *Onslow.*] I do not want to go into the question at all of whether this work which you have described as military work comes from the Government factories or not; but I presume that your object would be that all work done for the Government should be done in factories?

In factories the same as I described. I have no objection even if they are done by a middle man, providing he carries out the suggestions about eight hours a day, and allowing nine square feet space. I do not believe the sweaters would get much then if these suggestions were carried out. I have no objection to that at all.

3659. But supposing that were carried out, it is conceivable that some of the Government work would be given to a man who did other work, who worked for people, not the Government?

Probably so.

3660. Would not then the result be that if he was compelled to do the Government work in his factory, he would be compelled to put out the private work into the hands of the sweaters?

No; but those persons who give out the work would have to submit to the same regulations as this man.

3661. But you are supposing that there is an alteration in the law; I am speaking of the law as it stands at present. If it was made compulsory (as it is),

is), that Government work should only be done in factories, may it not have this effect; that it would drive work, not Government work, into the sweaters' dens?

Are you talking about the present state of affairs?

3662. Yes?

Yes, of course, it would be so.

3663. *Chairman.*] The same thing would happen in fact as you said happened with reference to the railway clothes?

Yes, doing the military work outside at first, and then doing the railway work out, and they would do it with private work as well. If a man got military work and got private work as well, he would not give out the private work, because the man he would have to give it to would have to submit to the same regulations as this man.

3664. Earl of *Onslow.*] The effect of the combination in Leeds has been to drive the work to London, I understand you?

To send it to London because they know that we are working here longer hours.

3665. Might not combination in Leeds and London have the effect of sending the work abroad?

No. We have a man who came over from Australia; he is a member of our society; he came back from Australia, and I asked him to give me a descriptive account of the workshops there, and he says that they get the same money as they do here, and the hours of labour are from seven o'clock in the morning until six o'clock in the evening; they work shorter hours over there.

3666. Australia is a long way off; but is it not conceivable that these Polish Jews who come over to England might remain in their own country and do the work there?

But the carriage of sending the work backwards and forwards would be just as much to the manufacturer as the saving.

3667. You think the cost of carriage would have the effect of preventing it?

Yes, I think the carriage would be much greater than what the reduction of hours would be.

3368. I think you rather mis-quoted what Miss Potter said. Miss Potter said that as far as the coat-making trade was concerned, the people engaged in that trade are able to take care of themselves, except as regards sanitation; and again, "this coat trade did not exist till the Jews came over;" and again, "the Jew brought in the sub-division of labour in the making of the coat;" and she then was asked whether she thought tailors and tailoresses "a population in extremely miserable circumstances," and she said, "Not the Jewish section, and not the coat trade." Do you disagree with that?

I do disagree with that. Of course, when I stated just now that she had said that those engaged in the coat trade had no cause of complaint, I took it from a report in a daily paper; I had not seen the official report, but it is not true that the sub-division of labour began when the Jewish labour arose. I have documents to show that 50 years ago the working tailors at that time petitioned the Privy Council, and I could quote a portion of their memorial, which shows that their own class began a sub-division of labour too. Of course there were Jews at that time as well, but just one or two; and the thing has now extended to a point which it had not at that time.

3669. We have been constantly told that the effect of the immigration of Polish Jews has been to take away work which was formerly done by the English workmen. Miss Potter told us that the coat trade, as now carried on, had sprung up since the commencement of the Jewish immigration; do you agree with that?

The result of this immigration has certainly led to greater sub-division of labour on account of the short term of apprenticeship; but if a four or five years' apprenticeship

apprenticeship was placed on these people it would make no difference whether a Jew or Gentile worked at it.

3670. That is not what I asked; I ask, is it a fact that the Jews brought their trade with them, or did they find their trade in the hands of English workers and drive them out; I am speaking of the coat trade?

To a certain extent they did drive the work out of their hands; I mean the sweaters, not the workmen. I pointed out that two years ago a man got 17 *s.* for making a frock coat or morning coat; a sweater went to this place and now makes the thing for 9 *s.* or 10 *s.*; this is in consequence of the great subdivision of labour.

3671. But where were the coats made before this subdivision of labour, in the East End or the West End?

These coats were made in the neighbourhood of the shop, and the work is now made by an East End sweater. The whole blame is put upon the sweater, not upon the workers; and the man who previously made the coat does not live there at all, but in the East End.

3672. Then I understand you to say that formerly the coat was made in the neighbourhood of the tailors' shops, and now it is sent out into a different quarter of London, namely, the East End, where it is made by the Jewish sweaters or by other sweaters?

Yes; of course there are English sweaters as well as Jewish ones.

3673. Lord *Thring.*] Miss Potter told us, as I understood her, that the best coat trade was in the hands of the English mechanic; do you agree with her in that?

I do not know how she defines the best work.

3674. She defines it by saying that if any of us took off his coat, she could tell by looking at it whether it was the work of an English mechanic, as she designated him, or of a Jewish contractor (*Nos.* 3264 *and* 3265 *in Miss Potter's Evidence are read over to the Witness*)?

I quite agree with that.

3675. Do you also agree with what Miss Potter conveyed to me, that the English mechanic trade, as I will call it, was separate and distinct from the Jew contractor trade, and that they did not practically interfere with one another; do you agree with that distinction; is the trade conducted by the English mechanic distinct from the trade conducted by the Jew contractor?

Not in all cases; the same garment as is made by the English mechanic is made also in a sweater's den by the subdivision of labour.

3676. Then you say that Miss Potter was incorrect in saying that a coat of an English mechanic was wholly made by English mechanics?

I disagree with her altogether. Now I know a waistcoat maker who made a waistcoat for Mr. C. T. Ritchie. The same thing applies to coats. No doubt Mr. C. T. Ritchie paid a very good price, and went to a very good tailor to have his garments made, but the thing was sent down to an East End den.

3677. *Chairman.*] You said just now that Miss Potter was quite correct in what she said as to the way in which the lining was put in?

That is as regards the workmanship of it.

3678. Lord *Thring.*] But let us follow this up for one moment, please; I am not asking you for isolated instances, but as a general rule is it the fact that there is a distinction between the coats made by the English mechanic and the coats made by the Jew contractor?

Of course there is this distinction——

3679. Is it the fact that they are generally made by different workmen, that the same coat, an English mechanic coat, is usually made by the English mechanic, and the Jew contractor's coat is made by the Jew contractor's workman?

No, the Jewish sweater would make the same garments as the English mechanic;

mechanic; but though he would get the same price for making, his workpeople would not get the advantage of that

3680. Take the coat that I am wearing; I will assume that the coat I wear is made by the seam being tacked on to the back, and not in the balloon fashion; has this coat which I wear and describe to you been made wholly by English mechanics, or partly by English mechanics and partly by Jew contractors?
The same class of goods would be made by both.

3681. I ask you, the same coat?
One coat would be made by an English mechanic.

3682. Throughout?
One coat would.

3683. Then Miss Potter is correct in stating that a certain class of coat is made wholly by English mechanics, and a certain other class of coat is made by Jewish contractors?
That is a different question altogether, now.

3684. *Chairman.*] What I understand you to say is that one individual coat would be made either by an English mechanic or by a Jewish contractor?
Yes.

3685. But I understand you also to say, that taking a particular class of coats some of them might be made by a Jewish contractor or an English mechanic?
Yes.

3686. Lord *Thring.*] Would they be made in the same way?
No; the Jewish contractor would subdivide the labour.

3687. *Chairman.*] You said that there is a class of coat of which some might be made by the Jewish contractor and some by the English mechanic. I want to know whether you, being an expert, could distinguish between the one and the other?
Yes.

3688. Could I, who am not an expert, distinguish between one and the other.
With the exception of the stitching you could not, because you would not know where to look for it.

3689. Was Miss Potter correct in saying that you can distinguish by the way in which the linings and sleeves are put in?
Not exactly by that, that is inside work; you could only detect it by outside work. I believe Miss Potter could; she has had a three weeks' experience, and I know one of the workshops she has been working in; she, probably, would discover the difference between the work, not by the inside but by the outside.

3690. Perhaps you will explain to the Committee how you can tell the difference between a frock coat made by an English mechanic at Poole's, and a frock coat made by a Jewish contractor?
I would first look at the stitching of the lining, and by looking at the breast-pocket I discover at once. There is a difference between the work of a practical machine-hand working in a sweater's den, and an inexperienced machine-hand working for an English mechanic.

3691. Lord *Thring.*] Do the same firm employ English mechanics to make one set of coats, and Jewish contractors to make another set of coats.
No, they employ them to do the same class of goods.

3692. *Chairman.*] And do you mean that they resemble one another so much that the ordinary customer would not find out the difference?
There is a great deal of difference between the two, but the ordinary customer would not detect the difference as a tailor would.

3693. If I ordered two coats, should I be able to tell that one was made on the

the premises by an English mechanic, the other off the premises by a Jewish contractor.

You would notice the difference, but your Lordship would not know which was the right way and which the wrong way; you would think the wrong one was right and the right one was wrong.

3694. Lord *Thring*.] I go to a West End firm and order a coat, and that West End firm employs English mechanics; would that West End firm send me a coat made by an English mechanic, or by a Jewish contractor, or both indifferently; would they consider one as good as the other?

No, they do not consider one as good as the other, though they might not let you know about it; they might send you home one made at the sweating den, or they might send you home one made by the English mechanic; it all depends upon the time they have on hand; if the English mechanic is busy they might have to send it down to the sweater.

3695. But you say that a West End firm would send me a Jewish contractor's coat when he ought to send me an English mechanic's?

Yes, they would do it; they have done it and cheated me.

3696. Earl of *Onslow*.] I want to know whether you agree with another statement made by Miss Potter. She said, in answer to Question 3266, "The best work is done in the workshop of a retail house, and the second-class work is done in the house of the English mechanic, where he employs his own wife. But a good many West End firms are beginning to employ Jewish contractors. For instance, a man like Miles in Brook-street, and the Civil Service Stores, and the Army and Navy, get all their work done by the Jewish sweaters;" do you agree with that from your experience?

Yes; not "all;" they do not have all their work done in that way.

3697. *Chairman*.] Do you agree with that?

With that, but not with the "all." I said they do not get all their work done; the substance of that I agree with.

3698. Earl of *Onslow*.] What I quoted was, that she said "A good many West End firms are beginning to employ Jewish contractors"?

Not only beginning, they have done it for a long while.

3699. And then Miss Potter went on to say that "a man like Miles in Brook-street, and the Civil Service Stores, and the Army and Navy, get all their work done by the Jewish sweaters"?

Not all; I agree with the substance, but there are some details I object to. For instance, when she says that they are beginning to give their work out to sweaters. They have given it out, and for a long time; and with regard to the Army and Navy and Civil Service Stores, I believe in some cases they give the work home to their own *employés*, but a large proportion of their work is done n sweaters' dens.

3700. Do you believe that the giving out of work from West End shops to the sweaters in the East End is on the increase?

Yes, it is increasing, and if we go on at that rate we shall have no tailors at all; we shall have only divisionalists in a few years to come, no experts.

3701. Lord *Thring*.] You, being an expert, what do you consider to be the difference in the money value between a coat made by an English mechanic and a coat made by a Jewish contractor, the material being the same?

From whatever standpoint you take it I would say 8*s*. or 9*s*.; if the one is 5*s*. I should make the other 13*s*.; if the one is 10*s*. I should make the other 18*s*.

3702. And why do you compute the difference of price to be so large?

The labour-time.

3703. As regards the value to the customer; what would you say was the difference in the value to me if I had a coat sent me, made by a Jewish contractor when I ought to have a coat sent me made by an English mechanic?

It would not last so long.

3704. How much am I damnified, the material being the same?
In the wearing of the garment, do you mean?

3705. Yes; how much loss do I sustain?
I believe about six months' wear.

3706. Why?
Because the other is partly machine work. The machine hand gets a number of coats to machine; he does not care whether it is good or bad, providing he gets it out of his hand; and the presser again does not care, he throws it out of his hand, and consequently the customer is deceived; and that is because they are not apprenticed people.

3707. Then in the value you stated, you mean that in the value to the customer there would be that difference?
Yes; that is why I say that the customers are deceived.

3708. Earl of *Derby.*] Did I rightly understand you to say just now that sub-division of labour in the trade enabled more work to be produced in the time, because by habitually doing the same thing a man became more skilful at it?
Yes.

3709. Is that what you object to; that he should produce more in the same time?
No, I do not object to that; but either the workers or the public should receive the benefit of it; I do not see why the manufacturer or the shopkeeper or the sweater should receive that advantage. I would suggest this, that in case of a large number of garments or any kind of article being turned out by the same people, in proportion, the number of hours should be reduced; that is, I laid stress on this, that where a machine could turn out four or five times the amount of the article, the hours should follow that, because three men do the work of four.

3710. Do you object to three men doing the work of four?
Of course I do; what is the fourth man going to do; who is going to keep him. If he is going to the workhouse the other three men will have to subscribe towards his maintenance.

3711. Then your idea is not that it is desirable that the largest amount of work should be done with the least expenditure of labour, but that the amount of work should be so spread out so as to employ the largest amount of labour possible?
Exactly.

3712. Lord *Clinton.*] You think that it is the existence of the sweater that has attracted the foreign immigration to a great extent?
Yes, I said so. If there had been a reduced number of hours and a term of apprenticeship they would never have come here; that is the only way I would prevent it.

3713. But how does the sweater engage workpeople now?
I was going to mention that. There is a slave market, a certain place, or rather two places, one on Saturday and one on Sunday, in the East End of London.

3714. *Chairman.*] Where are these places?
One at the other end of Golston-street, and the other would be in Whitechapel, the corner of Commercial-street; they parade there, walk up and down, or talk to each other, and wait until the sweater comes for them Sometimes the sweater's wife will engage them, sometimes an agent will engage them, and they walk about until they obtain a job. That is the recognised place for the workers; that is what I call the slave market.

3715. What passes between the sweater and the men?
Supposing he finds a number of men, four or five, he says to them in the jargon language in the Hebrew dialect, "Do you know a machiner" or presser, as

as the case may be; if there is one among them he say, "yes, I am a presser," or baster; if not, he will walk higher up till he finds another body of men standing, and will ask them; and then the workers will recommend each other to him, and then there are agents running about, and they get a commission both from the employer and from the employed.

3716. Lord *Clinton.*] But what is the engagement; I will work for so much?

"I want a presser," and they say, how much will you take a day? (the question of the hours is left out), he says so much; if he agrees to the price he says, come on, I will try you; but sometimes they do not ask him the price, and the sweater tries the man, and gets him to work half a day, or a day, as the case may be, and the sweater gives him whatever he likes.

3717. Then is he liable to be discharged at once with no notice?

No notice at all.

3718. In the evening he would say, I shall not want you to-morrow?

Yes, there is no notice.

3719. You mentioned the Army and Navy Stores; there are two establishlishments, I think, under that name?

I mentioned the Army and Navy Stores in Victoria-street, and then I mentioned the Junior Army and Navy Stores.

3720. But what you said applies to both, that they give out some of their work?

Yes, it applies to both; I have given the names of their sweaters.

3721. Lord *Monkswell.*] You said you had heard of a row about overtime; is it usual to have rows about overtime?

Yes; I will give you an instance. I worked for this Mr. Fromberg, in Princess-street, 18 months. Being a good workmen, I objected to work more than 13 or 14 hours, as the case may be. I only wanted to work six and a-half hours for the half day, and I came in at seven and left off at half-past one, but he had at that time six machines at work, and I being the principal machine hand, the others left off when they saw me leave off. This man called me into the parlour and said, "Look here, I have six machines at work, and if you leave off the others will; I will pay you for the half hour if you work up to two o'clock," but then, of course, he would not pay the others. I said, "Very well, you pay me for a half-hour's work," and when the other men came out in the evening I gave them the tip; they worked till two o'clock, and they would not work after half-past one.

3722. You said that if a sweater has more machines he gets paid a less price; do you mean that there is an adjustment, the person asking or finding out how many machines the sweater has before the rate of remuneration is settled?

Yes; it is generally known what quantity of work they can turn out.

3723. Do you mean that a man would not try to get the work done as cheap as he can, but will deliberately find out beforehand, before he settles the price, how many machines the sweater has?

But he has the price on his books; he will give it to him.

3724. You mean the larger sweater has the smaller price on his books?

He has a list of prices: 3 *s.* for jackets, 4 *s.* for morning coats; he wants his work made at that price; the sweaters will only make them at that price. If a sweater has four machines, and another has two, the sweater who has four will get the advantage over one who has two.

3725. But you said that the sweater got paid less in proportion to the number of machines he employed?

I said that the sweaters got paid a good price, but that the workers do not get anything of it; but in the slop trade it is usual to ask the sweater when they engage him how many machines he has got, because they want to know the quantity of work he can turn out; and I know of two cases where for the same

garments it is 2 *d.* cheaper in the case of the man who employs a large number of machines.

3726. Then what do you mean, do you mean that the sweaters who employ a larger number of machines has an advantage, because he can take work at a cheaper price?

Yes, because three machine hands can do the work of four machine hands; but that is a purely economical question, which they know; we can see that as well as they; that is our objection.

3727. It comes to this, that the large sweater makes a much greater profit than the small sweater?

Yes, I pointed that out. I made certain suggestions; I have carefully considered them as a workman, and I think if they were carried out it would stop a lot of these things. The great curse of the sweating system is the sub-division of labour, and the non-apprenticeship system, because the factories, for instance, will take on a number of girls one season, and teach them a divisional part of the trade; and the next season they will not take the same girls on to work, but another set of girls, and teach them a divisional part; and so we get these tailoresses and machine hands, with only short terms of apprenticeship; and it is a misery unto themselves. I say it would be a good thing for the workers themselves if they were compelled to be apprenticed four or five years, because, I believe, for the reasons which I explained, in this particular trade, they would be more independent of the sweater, and of the manufacturers. I want to drive these middlemen out as far as I possibly can, and get the worker to come in contact with, and nearer to the consumer. That is my main object. Of course I do not think it will be carried out, but from my point of view, that is so. I spoke about Mr. Ritchie's waistcoat; I should like to say that that waistcoat was made by a woman in the East End.

3728. Earl of *Onslow.*] I want to ask you a question as to whether you agree with what was said by Miss Potter, because the Committee rather thought that the evidence given by Miss Potter was of a different nature from that which we had from other Witnesses. Miss Potter says, in answer to Question 3261, "The first class, the bespoke work, pays very good wages indeed, the machinists run from about 7 *s.* to 9 *s.* 6 *d.*, and the pressers run from about 5 *s.* to 8 *s.* 6 *d.*, and the women are rarely under 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a day, sometimes they go up to 5 *s.* a day for twelve hours' work. Then the second class, the stock work, is also fairly paid; it is more regular than the bespoke work, but the pay is not quite so high; the machinists run from 3 *s.* to 6 *s.*, pressers will run from 5 *s.* to 8 *s.*, and the women are as low as 1 *s.* 6 *d.*; but there are no women employed in the coat trade lower than 1 *s.* 6 *d.*, except as apprentices, and then of course they are employed for what they are worth. Practically in the coat trade there is nothing to be complained of in the wages. You have irregular hours, and you have bad sanitation of shops." Now do you agree generally with that?

I dispute all those statements with the exception of the sanitation.

3729. You disagree as to the rate of wages?

I disagree entirely.

3730. Lord *Thring.*] On what ground do you disagree; do you deny the fact that the wages are as they are stated?

I deny the fact that a man gets from 7 *s.* 6 *d.* to 9 *s.*; of course he does sometimes, but what I understand from Miss Potter is that it is every day.

3731. *Chairman.*] Miss Potter stated that it is three days a week?

Then the 7 *s.* 6 *d.* would be for about three days, but the 9 *s.* I do not know, and I have been 14 years in the trade; that is very seldom earned; it might be perhaps one or two, but we cannot take them when we are speaking of the general thing; they are isolated cases.

3732. Earl of *Onslow.*] Then you do not disagree with the statement that a machinist has been known to earn as much as 9 *s.* 6 *d.* in the first class bespoke trade?

There might be one out of a thousand.

3733. Nine

3733. Nine shillings and sixpence would be very high, and 7 *s.* would be perhaps low?

No, 9 *s.* 6 *d.* I do not know of; I know of 9 *s.*; 7 *s.* is the rate of wages that some of the slop machinists would get, but then the average of those would be perhaps 12 *s.* a week. It is all very well for me getting 7 *s.* 6 *d.* one day when I have to live five days on it.

3734. The question I asked was whether it was a fair statement of the rate of wages for the days on which they were employed?

Yes, for the days. But I understand Miss Potter meant to convey a different thing altogether. Of course the statement is right, but the meaning, the impression that it makes upon the mind, is different altogether. The statement is right to a certain extent, but the impression is different. Some persons would go away with the idea that we get that every day in the week, but that is only for the skilled workers, that is all; and then the day would consist of 14 or 15 hours. Then in the bespoke trade the machinist work piece-work, not day-work.

3735. *Chairman.*] Do you think that 7 *s.* a day is a fair average sum to put as the wages that a machinist would earn?

By piece-work; but sometimes he does not earn that, though he has to be in the workshop all day; sometimes he only earns 3 *s.* Now I have worked in the West End, and some days I have earned 7 *s.* and 7 *s.* 6 *d.*, but I had to be in the workshop the next day, and only earned 3 *s.*; it varies. Miss Potter did not state that.

3736. Earl of *Onslow.*] I will read you what Miss Potter did say. The question I asked you just now was with regard to the rates of wages that the men were making; now I will ask you whether you will agree to a statement made by Miss Potter in her evidence as to the number of days they work; "In the coat shops the average is from three to four days in the week, taking it all the year round; which, of course, brings down the wages considerably"; do you agree to that?

No; because it is only in certain seasons that they have this number of days.

3737. Then do you say that taking the year all round the average number of days a man is employed is less than from three to four?

Yes; decidedly so.

3738. Lord *Thring.*] What average would you say?

Not more than two. I was engaged for a long time in the West End and on the bespoke trade, and for six or seven months in the year I was there, I was running up and down for half a day's or a day's work in the week.

3739. *Chairman.*] You mean that for six or seven months in the year you only got a day's or half a day's work in the week?

Yes; but, of course, when I got a job in the East End I did it; I could not live upon the other. Take this season, it is very busy; then come Whitsun holidays; after Whitsuntide they will walk about for two weeks idle; then it will come on for a few days in the week. I have a scheme at home to show that the work could be made regular; they do not want to make it regular.

3740. Lord *Monkswell.*] Is there a great and general desire among the men that it should be more regular?

Certainly; they prefer working shorter hours; that the work should be distributed; they do not want to kill themselves one day and have nothing at all to do the other. If they over-work themselves one day they have to be in bed the next. I have often done it myself; you cannot help it.

3741. *Chairman.*] I wish to ask you what you mean by limiting the hours of labour; because, in reply to Lord Derby just now, you said something to this effect, that you did not think it advisible that as much work as possible should be produced with the least possible quantity of labour, but that, on the contrary, there ought to be as much labour as possible employed to produce a given quantity of work; is that what you really mean?

 I add

I add to that this, that if there was a quantity of work turned out in the least possible time, the workers should receive the advantage.

3742. My impression is that you, once or twice in your evidence, have mentioned the limiting the hours of the labour to 12 hours a day; to what extent do you think they ought to be limited?

I do not think I said 12, I think I mentioned eight. If we cannot get eight I shall take 12; that is four hours off; I shall take what I can get.

3743. But your object is to reduce it to eight hours?

Yes, to eight hours; but I do not want to injure the trade by it; I did not say that we do it sweepingly; I know we shall inflict a great wrong upon the workers if we do this sweepingly; I am prepared to do this in 20 years, gradually bring it down to eight hours. Though I hold strong opinions, I know it cannot be done at once.

3744. If there were two men out of work, and one man was working eight hours a day, would you propose to reduce it still further, to six hours a day?

Exactly so, till everybody is employed; but if we have a proper system of work, there is no necessity for men being out of work; it is only by this subdivision of labour that men are thrown out of work; it is also caused by the short term of apprenticeship. There is a firm that takes on a body of females to teach them a divisional part of their trade; the next year they do not take on these same girls, but they take other girls on; the consequence is that those girls who were working in this firm last year are walking about the streets applying for work elsewhere; not being mechanics in any particular branch they walk about from one place to another, and they are no use except to the factory for the time being. But if these girls were apprenticed for four or five years, so that the remaining part would be kept at home, or go to school till the proper time, they would be proper workers. I have no objection to females coming in to our trade, but I have an objection to their being taught a divisional part of the trade for the benefit of the manufacturer. I believe a girl is as capable of doing the work as a man, but I want her to receive the same wage. Labour is labour, whether it is performed by a man or a woman, but the manufacturers take advantage of the females, because they generally can live cheaper; but I think the food of a woman ought to be the same as that of a man.

3745. You spoke in your evidence, I think, of some West End firms giving out some of their work to their old employés to do at home?

Yes.

3746. Is that a very common thing?

That is done at Poole's at the present time, but I have no objection to that.

3747. Is that common?

Only in a few cases; in some cases the firm do not consider the old employés, they turn them out.

3748. Is that work done by the old employés, or do they sub-let it?

No, by themselves; they may have the assistance of their wives; but I have no objection to that. Being old employes they do not wish to mix with some of the younger men. I know some of their tricks are very awkward; I have no objection to that provided it does not go any further; but that is really the mother of sweating by commencing; it should not go any further.

3749. Does it go any further, as a matter of fact?

In some cases it does; but if some of my suggestions were carried out it could not possibly go beyond what it is now, because what I said was, that every place should be registered where persons are being worked for profit. In a case of that kind where a man takes work to do at home and is doing it either himself, or with his wife, he would not be doing it for profit at all; that would not be so objectionable.

3750. It has been suggested to the Committee, that the landlord should be compelled

compelled to register the rooms where work is carried on at a profit, and not the occupier; have you considered that?

I do not consider that practicable at all. I should only make that man responsible who was getting the profit. Of course the landlord is getting part of the profit, but he is not in contact with the workers direct. We must hold the person responsible who is in contact with the workers direct. In many cases the landlord does not come down for his rent himself; he knows nothing at all about it; he gets a profit indirectly; but I should only hold those responsible who were in direct contact with the workers.

3751. Earl of *Onslow.*] But we were told that the landlord's rent collector comes every week?

Yes, but the landlord himself does not.

3752. But the rent collector is the agent of the landlord?

Yes; but how can I be sure that he is going to tell the landlord that this is carried on as a workshop.

3753. Supposing there was a penalty on the landlord for non-registration, would not the visit of the rent collector be a sufficient guarantee that the landlord was aware of it?

It would be; but I should hold the man in contact direct with the workers responsible; it would be far easier that somebody connected with them, the man who is getting a profit, should be held responsible direct; in fact, it would be much easier for the landlord. I think your Lordships said that when I finished the artist should describe certain portions of these dens which he has been in, if your Lordships would examine him for about five or 10 minutes; he has been in them himself and taken sketches from them, and being an impartial witness he would give your Lordships impartial evidence.

Chairman.] The description that we have had is sufficient.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. THOMAS JELLIFFE, having been re-called; is further Examined, as follows:

3754. *Chairman.*] Have you anything to add to the evidence you gave to the Committee on a former occasion?

I should like to call your Lordship's attention to the system of payment by cheques which exists in the East-end of London. At the time of the Mansion House Relief Fund, when the money was collected for the Mansion House Fund, I was appointed on the committee which was to assist in distributing the money in the Shoreditch district. Last winter the committee was called together to see what steps should be taken to look after the amount of distress which was then existing. At a meeting at the Town Hall in Shoreditch a member of this Mansion House Relief Committee stated that at "The London Apprentice," in Old-street, they cashed cheques for those men that had sold their goods in Curtain-road; and he stated that something like 6 *d.* in the £. was the amount stopped from these cheques for accommodation. That evidence was given by one of the committee in the presence of Mr. Cremer and Professor Stuart, M.P. I have not been able to verify the fact that that amount of money is stopped from the cheques; but I know this, that at "The London Apprentice" the men take the cheques in there of a Saturday and pass them over the counter, and hand up a bottle to show that something may be placed in it, whatever they choose, in the shape of liquor or in the shape of cigars. I have seen it done myself, and I think that it is a very great hardship on these men, because they have been beaten down to the lowest possible price with these large dealers in the Curtain-road; not only beaten down, but they have been subject to a further reduction of 2½ per cent., and then in cashing these cheques there is a further reduction; and not only that, but they cannot stand at the bar without having something to drink; and I think that is a system which should be

abolished in its entirety, because it is not only encouraging these men to intemperance, but it is still further lowering the amount of money which they have received for their work. These men, of course, when they get their wages are bound to take this cheque and get it cashed there, because they want the money to take home, and pay to the poor wretches that work for them. If they could keep the cheque on till Monday they could get it cashed at the bankers' without any discount, but seeing that they are not in a position to do that, they are obliged to change it there or elsewhere, wherever he can get the money for it.

3755. What you object to is their being paid too late on Saturday to get their cheques cashed at the bank?
My contention is that they should be paid in cash, unless they can have time enough to change the cheque at the bank.

3756. Is it the custom to pay them on Saturday?
Some of them pay them on Friday, but unless they can get the work in before four o'clock on Friday, they cannot get paid till Saturday.

3757. If they got their cheques on Saturday morning that would do?
The cheques are not given, as a rule, till the afternoon. You could come and see cheques changed to any amount at "The London Apprentice" on Saturday afternoon.

3758. And you think that is done because they have no option?
They have no option; they are obliged to get the money from somewhere.

3759. Lord *Thring*.] Is "The London Apprentice" a public-house?
Yes.

3760. And what you state is, that they deduct a considerable sum of money, and also make them take something in kind?
They give up a bottle, as a rule, when they give the cheque, and then they have whatever they like put in it, whatever they drink; it may be whiskey, rum, or gin, or brandy.

3761. Are these cheques crossed?
That I have not been able to ascertain; I have not been able to find distinctly whether they have been crossed or not.

3762. Cannot they cash a cheque to bearer without deduction?
At an ordinary shop, do you mean?

3763. At an ordinary shop?
It is not every one that has sufficient cash that would do so.

3764. As a matter of fact, you do not think they can?
I do not think so; they accomodate them at the public-house I have mentioned.

3765. The public-house acts as a sort of banker, in fact?
Yes.

3766. And supposing you wanted to cash these cheques at the counting-house of the person who gives them, could you do that if you liked?
I have not been able to ascertain whether those in the Curtain-road would do that. I should strongly contend for the registration of workshops, which has been stated by so many witnesses; that every workshop should be registered, so that we should know where they are, and how to get at them; and also that a larger staff of Factory Inspectors should be appointed; there are not half enough now to do the work. I have been in London 26 years working as a cabinet-maker, and I have only seen one in the whole time that I have worked as a journeyman.

3767. I should like to ask you one more question, going back to these cheques; about what amount are they?
They vary from 1 *l.* up to 10 *l.*

3768. Then

3768. Then do I understand you that a house pays its wages always in cheques?
To these men that take the article in on the barrow; these men that make it up in these very lowest of the sweating dens, and take it round, and sell it for whatever they can get for it.

3769. And the buyer gives them a cheque for 1 *l.*?
In some cases if he has not sufficient cash with him. I have seen a cheque to a man for 25 *s.*

3770. And that cheque you say cannot be cashed in the neighbourhood in the way of payment?
I do not say it cannot; if you could get a shopkeeper to accommodate you it could, but I do not suppose there are a sufficient number in the place that would care about accommodating you with payment for a cheque.

3771. *Chairman.*] I want to ask you a question on the evidence you gave when you were last examined about the Admiralty work. You said, "But in Government work the same evil exists in the Admiralty work which is given out at Smee's shop," which is a very old shop in London. When the estimates are sent to that factory they are generally sent all over London, to see how much it can be made for; they take it all over Hoxton or Bethnal Green to see how much the sweaters shops can make it for." Then you go on in the next answer to say, "They ask the men first what they can make them for; then they send the drawings round to these sweating shops to ask what they can make them for; then the drawings are taken back to the shop; and the men are told, we can buy these at a certain price, and you must make them for the same." I understand you to mean that the workmen at Smee's factory are beaten down in their prices on the supposition that if they do not accept the same prices as the sweaters, the Admiralty work could be, and would be, put out to be done by these sweaters?
That is the case.

3772. The men employed in the factory think if they do not accept these prices the work will be put out; that is what you mean?
Yes.

3773. As a matter of fact the work is not put out?
Not in all cases; some is. They have a great many chests of drawers put out; I do not know whether they are for the Admiralty; they make a good many for the Admiralty.

3774. The men are ignorant of the fact that Government contracts cannot be put out?
I do not think that they are ignorant of the fact, but I do not think they care about stating it.

3775. How do you mean?
It is very possible they might get discharged if they said anything of the kind. There was a mistake in the way it was described in the newspaper; it was said in the newspaper report that it was given out to the piece-worker. But they do not employ the piece-worker; they employ their own men to work in the factory. It is a well-known fact that when they take the Government work they work a week for nothing; take no money at all. The amount of money paid to the worker is so small; supposing the job was worth 10 *l.* at 2 *l.* a week, it would be five weeks' work; if it took six weeks it would be a week for nothing; that is what I mean.

3776. According to the scale of prices, you mean, that you think fair?
Yes, what we think a fair wage.

3777. Lord *Monkswell.*] About asking for spirits, or being obliged to take spirits in a public-house, do you mean that when a man goes to get his cheque cashed he does not know how much he will have to spend in spirits, or is that left to the publican?

No, they know pretty well what they have to take. They hand up a bottle for a shillings' worth or 1 *s.* 6 *d.*; they give up a bottle with a certain capacity, and they generally get it filled.

3778. But when a man wants to cash a cheque for 10 *l.*, you say he has ten sixpences in the first place taken off; that is 5 *s.*; is there any reguler scale by which he knows how much he would have to spend in the public-house?

I said I could not say. It was reported in the committee I have referred to, that something like 6 *d.* in the £. was taken off.

3779. Do you mean that he has to pay 6 *d.* in the £. for spirits; not to take off 5 *s.* in cash?

No, he takes it out in kind.

3780. Lord *Clinton.*] Do you mean that the publican makes it a condition that the man, besides the 2½ per cent. which is taken off before he comes to the public-house, should take drink?

Yes, he cashes it with the supposition that he will take something. I do not say he compels them to do so, but it is a practice, which is almost a compulsion.

3781. Earl of *Onslow.*] With regard to these factories, which you say you have worked in, where the Factory Inspector has never been; are you quite sure that they came under the Factory and Workshops Acts?

Oh, yes; I have never seen any of them. I never saw a Factory Inspector but once.

3782. But why do you say you are quite sure they came under the Factory and Workshops Acts?

Because they had the regulations hung up.

3783. But were there young persons employed there?

No.

3784. Were there women employed there?

No; in the cabinet trade we only employ men.

3785. Then you are not aware that the Factory and Workshops Acts do not apply to a case where men only are employed?

The sanitary inspector, of course, would be the one to look after the sanitation of the place.

3786. That is not the Factory Inspector. I asked you whether you were certain that the Factory and Workshops Act applied to the factories in which you worked? You tell me that neither women nor young persons are employed there, and I ask you whether you are aware that the Factory and Workshops Acts apply to cases where women or young persons are employed?

I thought they were applicable to all factories. I did not know that they were not applicable to the cabinet-making trade.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. HARRY HAM, is called in, and, having been sworn; is Examined, as follows:

3787. *Chairman.*] ARE you in the same trade as the last witness?

Yes; I am the general secretary of the Alliance Cabinet Makers' Association. What is generally understood as a sweating shop in connection with the cabinet trade is a shop where men, to earn anything like a decent wage, have to sweat others to obtain it. The largest factory at the East-end at the present time, I allude to Lebus's, is conducted on this principle. When a man finds it impossible to earn anything like the sum he should be able to do, he is induced by the employer to seek assistance by employing a lad to work for him, and from one lad it gets to two or three; and there are several mechanics working in this shop that have three or four boys—"greeners," or what they term improvers, working for them. In my opinion, whilst such shops as this exist, the trade must

must have a downward tendency. The future of our trade is not at all hopeful, seeing the number of boys, youths and "greeners" that this system is introducing into an already over-crowded market, the result being that in a few years these youths will be sweating others as they are being sweated now. In this shop the lads are being sweated by the journeyman, the journeyman is being sweated by the employer, and the employer is being sweated by the dealer, who again sweats the customer. As far as my experience goes as a journeyman, extending over 30 years, the large linendrapery establishments, or so-called cabinet manufacturers, are chiefly responsible for the sweating carried on in connection with the cabinet trade; firms in some cases without any manufactory of their own, or without employing a single mechanic, by deception and misrepresentation palming off on the customer goods as being manufactured on the firm, when such goods have been made by garret-masters and sweaters of the worst description. I say "deception;" I will quote a case. I was going down the Tottenham Court road (this was not Maple's shop), and in a window I saw an article of furniture labelled as a brown oak sideboard; any mechanic could at once detect that it was not brown oak, only in colour; it had been made brown by an artificial process, not a natural brownness. That was lie number one. Underneath it there was another line, "our own manufacture." That shop never employed a mechanic; the sideboard must have been brought in. Another way of getting customers by deception is this: A well-known firm in Tottenham Court-road, some few years back, obtained a contract to furnish a large railway hotel in the North of England. Three manufacturers at the East End were consulted, A., B., and C., we will say; they were asked to send in two or three suites each as a specimen of their work, and on a certain day they were to attend at the firm, when a committee of inspection from the railway authorities attended to inspect the goods sent in; and I may say that the manufacturers were in attendance, not however as manufacturers, but as foremen for the firm which had the contract. After the goods had been inspected, A. was told that his suites had been selected by the committee of inspection. A. naturally thought after that admission that if the suites that were manufactured by A. were selected, he would carry out the contract; but, after waiting some time, and going to the firm on several occasions to know when he was to commence the contract, he was told, "It will be all right in the end;" but ultimately he ascertained, and it was the fact that, after his suites had been inspected and the quality of the work well looked into, the contract was given to C. The price of one particular suite that A. contracted for was, in round figures, 24 *l.* The sum received by C. (I must give you to understand that it was an exact copy of A.'s; so your Lordship will see that A. was certainly swindled out of the design he had been at the trouble of obtaining; I do not think "swindled" is too hard a term to use) was 18 *l.*, or about 6 *l.* less than A.'s price. The sum which was to be paid to A.'s workmen for making one particular wardrobe was (this was mutually agreed to between employer and employed) 8 *l.* 10 *s.*; the price paid by C. to his workman was 5 *l.* 15 *s.*; so that C.'s workmen were sweated out of something like 1,000 *l.*, roughly speaking, there being over 300 wardrobes to be made.

3788. Before you leave that, what is it exactly that you complain of in the transaction?

I contend that after an employer has been to the trouble and expense of getting designs out and having them made at the factory, and the committee of inspection have said that it is a superior class of work, there would be more likelihood of the job, and it was through that that the contract was obtained; then I think it amounts to a fraud almost to give the contract to someone else after that.

3789. You say that after A. had been at the expense of getting the designs, practically they were taken from him without any payment by C.?

That is my point.

3790. You say that A. got the contract?

He understood from the contractors that his suites had been selected; he naturally

naturally thought he would get from the contractors the sub-contract to make the whole of the suites.

3791. Lord *Thring.*] What is your objection in the statement you are making to the Committee; what do you wish to prove?
I want to prove the system under which the trade is conducted at the present time.

3792. *Chairman.*] Three manufacturers, I understand you, competed for this order; A., B., and C.?
Yes.

3793. A. was given to understand that his tender would be accepted?
Yes, that his suites had been selected by the examining committee.

3794. What do you mean by "given to understand"?
The foreman at the factory told him, "They have decided to have your pattern."

3795. As a matter of fact, they did not decide to have his, but did decide to take C.'s?
The committee decided that his goods should be the pattern that should be made. After that statement he naturally thought that the contractor would give him the sub-contract; but instead of that it was given to C., because C., I suppose, agreed to do it for a less sum.

3796. They accepted his design and gave the contract to another man, that is what you say.
Yes.

3797. That you consider a grievance?
Yes.

3798. Lord *Thring.*] But how does it affect any general system; it is an isolated case of injustice?
Yes; I quote that as an example of the way the trade is conducted.

3799. *Chairman.*] You mean to say that that is a thing of common occurrence?
Yes.

3800. Are not men in the position of those manufacturers quite able to protect themselves?
They ought to be if they had a little more self-reliance.

3801. Will you go on with your statement?
There is no doubt that in the past few years the trade has changed from the manufacturer to the capitalist and dealer, who, as a rule, employs a number of small trade masters, and with the means at his command induces the small masters to enter into the fiercest competition with each other, the one sole object being cheapness, quality being a secondary consideration. The result in the end is that the workman has to suffer. I may observe here that you have been told by a previous witness that the wage in our particular trade has risen about 2 *d.* an hour in the last 20 or 25 years. That is so; but still I contend that work is not any better paid for than it was then, nor so well. What I mean is this: that a man without a doubt has to produce 50 per cent. more work now than he had 20 or 25 years ago. It was a common thing then for a mechanic to go into the workshop, and scarcely think fit to take his waistcoat and collar off. Now, if a mechanic is to earn anything like a living, he has to divest himself of everything but trousers, shirt, and stockings. In my opinion, the whole manner in which our trade is now conducted is rotten to the core; the profits going into the wrong pockets. As a proof of this, I know a number of employers who, after being in business for years, and employing 20, 40, and 60 men, are now employing only two or three, and in some cases are again working at the bench as journeymen, while the dealer himself is still flourishing. The most effectual remedy for this state of things would be to stamp out the so-called manufacturer by the consumers giving their orders direct to the producers.

ducers. They would then obtain better work at lower prices. I look at it in this light: if a trade shop makes a cabinet, and it is sent into a dealer's place we will say for 30 *l.*, an advance of 20 *l.* on that is no uncommon price to ask. Well, I take it that if the consumer went direct to the producer the employer would be able to pay his workmen, say, a couple of pounds more for the job; he himself would get about 8 *l.*, and the consumer would be 10 *l.* in pocket, supposing he got 40 guineas for the job.

3802. The Earl of *Derby.*] Where do you say the profits stick; in the pocket of the speculative dealer?

In the dealer, and I agree with the previous speaker that Government might render some assistance in this direction by seeing that their contracts are carried out direct by the parties who contract, and not sub-let, as is so often the case.

3803. *Chairman.*] Do you assert that they are sub-let?

Yes.

3804. Of your own knowledge?

One shop has been named. I should think, from information that I have gained in the trade, that of the Admiralty contract at Smee's now, there is not more than 25 per cent. made on the firm. I think I am within the mark when I say that.

3805. And the rest, you say, is put out to the garret masters?

The rest would be made out of doors. Again, when the estimates are out, I think they should be thrown open to all parties to estimate for, not confined to a certain few. Some few years ago Brew and Claris obtained the Admiralty contract; they employed no cabinet makers direct, but got one of the largest employers at that time in the East of London to carry out the contract for them. After making the goods, Brew and Claris' *employé* thought he would endeavour to get the contract himself on the next occasion, and on several occasions went to the Admiralty and asked that he should be allowed to contract, and asked for the specifications; but, as a matter of fact, he never had the opportunity.

3806. In this case you say that none of the Government contract was constructed by the contractor?

Not directly. They only employ one or two men to go out as what they term fitters in the trade; they employ no mechanics, only a man to go and fit up a wardrobe, or put up a glass frame, or anything of that kind; they have no factory of their own.

3807. Earl of *Derby.*] Did I understand you to say that 50 per cent. more work is produced by a man now than was the case 20 years ago?

Without a doubt.

3808. Is that in consequence of a greater use of machinery?

Even without machinery; where machinery is not used, the man has to produce that amount of work now more than he used 25 years ago.

3809. Do you mean that 20 years ago he was only producing one-third as much work in the same time?

I do believe so.

3810. How is the increase of work accomplished if not by the help of machinery?

In some shops it is by that.

3811. But where it is not by that, how is it accomplished?

He has to work harder to produce the 50 per cent. more work; a man has to work at a rate which is an injury to his constitution, no doubt of it, and I know plenty of men at my own age, men who ought to be in the prime of life, who are only a wreck of what Nature intended them to be; you can see it in their faces.

3812. Do you mean that the work is scamped?
To some extent a man is compelled to do that.

3813. To what extent, 50 per cent?
Not to that extent; I should say 10 per cent. might be allowed for inferior workmanship, giving it the go-by as they term it.

3814. Do I understand you also to say that employers have fewer men in their employment now to do the same work as formerly?
Without a doubt that is so.

3815. And the remedy that you would propose is that the customers should by some means or other be brought into direct communication with the producers?
In my opinion that would be the salvation of our trade.

3816. That, I presume, does not require any Legislature or administrative action; it is a matter that rests with the trade itself?
That should be so.

3817. It could be done, for instance, by means of an association?
My opinion is that, if a large majority of the trade belonged to a union, we could remedy many of the existing evils without applying to the Legislature for any assistance.

3818. You have a union?
We have a union, a very limited number, not above something between 1,100 and 1,200.

3819. But is it not sufficiently powerful to effect these objects to which you attach so much importance, or has not that mode of action been taken into consideration?
For the limited number of our workers I contend that we have done well in the past by holding our ground so well as we have. There is not a shadow of doubt that in what we term society shops the men can earn a better wage than they do in non-society shops, without working to such an extent as they do there.

3820. Then, as I understand you, your quarrel is not with the employer, but with the dealer who makes his profit out of the employer?
That is my point; that is the evil of the trade.

3821. And when you gave us that graphic description of every class in the trade sweating some other class, you used the word sweating in a very vague sense; you meant making an undue profit?
Yes.

3822. Lord *Monkswell.*] Your union does not attempt to bring the buyer and the workman into communication in any way, does it?
We are not powerful enough.

3823. You have got no organization with that view?
No.

3824. Lord *Thring.*] Do I understand you to say that if men are well fed they are killed by hard work?
But they might not be well fed.

3825. But if they do this hard work, I understand you to say that they get good wages?
If they work hard they do.

3826. Do you think that men who get good wages are killed by hard work?
Yes, I do. I know several men that carry out a phrase of Professor Leone Levi's, that a man should be allowed to make hay while the sun shines. I take that to mean that while he is in his youth he should be allowed to work as long and earn as much as he likes.

3827. Do

3827. Do you think that that injures his health?
I do.

3828. *Chairman.*] What wages do they earn in these non-society shops?
From 1*l.* to 1*l.* 12*s.* or 1*l.* 13*s.*

3829. All the year round?
If employed all the year round; some will have a greater amount of ability than others, of course.

3830. They have no difficulty in finding employment at that rate of wages?
A man can generally find work if he is prepared to go into any shop; when he has come down to starvation point he goes into one of these slop-shops, where they pay half the amount for the work that should be paid.

3831. I understand that you practically object to two points; first of all, that goods are marked as manufactured by firms when they really are not manufactured by them?
I object to that; I do not think it should be allowed.

3832. And you think that the existence of the middleman is, in fact, the chief ground of complaint?
I do.

3833. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] Has there been an alteration in the average length of hours during the last 10 or 20 years?
Not to any extent; the only point where we have reduced the hours is this: 20 or 25 years ago we had to leave off at 6 o'clock of a Saturday; then 12 or 14 years ago we brought down this to 4 o'clock, and about 9 or 10 years ago we brought it down to 2 o'clock.

3834. Are you acquainted with cases where an employer acts also as in fact a dealer, in order to avoid the middleman?
Yes; I was in such a shop.

3835. Is it better in those cases?
Yes, it was a great advantage to the workmen, in this way: I was on a job-settling committee for some years; the men working on the firm would select two in the shop who they considered were the most conversant with the prices that the firm could afford to pay; the job-settling committee would always get information whether the work contracted for was for a dealer or for a private customer, and, as a rule, when the men were working for a private customer, the price would allow them to earn 5*s.* 6*d.* or 7*s.* per week more than it would if the work was made for a dealer.

3836. Then we may assume that it is to avoid that kind of arrangement that dealers do not act as their own employers, but prefer to have a middleman?
Yes.

3837. *Chairman.*] What would become of the work that is done by people at home if it were not for these dealers; how do you suppose they could dispose of it; I mean not first-class goods but those articles of inferior quality the people make in their own homes and hawk about for sale?
I contend it is an evil.

3838. You would wish to abolish them?
Before men are ready to commence business in that way it would be better for them by far to be working at the bench, in my opinion.

3839. You would like to do away with that employment altogether?
Yes.

3840. There is one technical matter I should like you to explain: What do these improvers do; you spoke of one journeyman having two or three improvers; what work do they do?
The rough work, planing off; then the improver learns by degrees to mortise, then tenon, and so on; and then when he thinks he is capable of making a

simple job by himself he asks the employer to give him a job as a journeyman; that is done.

3841. How long do these improvers work as improvers?
It will depend on the time they commence. A boy perhaps is employed by the firm first to sweep up the shavings, and then one of the men takes him on as a boy; sometimes he will seek boy labour, and improve from another shop that has been 12 months or two years with another man; that is how they are obtained.

3842. It might be described as a kind of limited system of apprenticeship?
Limited.

3843. What is your objection to doing that?
My objection is this, that it enables a workman having four or five boys in his employ to produce the work at an unfair price.

3844. It enables him to produce the article cheaper than he otherwise would?
Yes.

3845. You object to the boys being employed because it reduces the price of the article?
The other men have to suffer for it if they have not got boys on.

3846. You do not object to it on account of the boys being overworked?
In some cases.

3847. Lord *Clinton.*] Does an "improver" answer to a "greener" in the boot trade?
No; an improver is a boy who has been at the trade one or two years, but is not quite sufficiently advanced to work as a journeyman.

3848. Earl of *Derby.*] I do not quite understand what you propose with regard to the competition of boys; do you think it should be prohibited?
It should be limited, I think.

3849. In what manner?
I think it is certainly wrong, looking to the future of the trade, for any employer to bring up any number of youths so that when they arrive at manhood there is not a chance of a decent living.

3850. Then you would limit compulsorily the numbers in the trade?
Just so.

3851. In order that there might not be more in it than would be reasonably certain of finding employment?
Just so.

3852. Lord *Clinton.*] Or you would have them regularly apprenticed for a certain time?
That would be by far the best course.

3853. So that they might learn the trade?
Yes.

3854. Earl of *Derby.*] But even so, I presume you would limit the number of apprentices for the reason that you have given already?
Yes.

3855. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] Would it be fair to assume that one reason why the middleman has sprung into existence is that formerly the workman did not exert himself as much as he might have done, did not take off his collar and waistcoat, as you told us just now?
I should think not.

3856. *Chairman.*] How many apprentices would you allow one journeyman to have?
We have no rule in our society bearing on that; but there is a common understanding that no one in our society should employ boy labour with the exception of his own son.

3857. And

3857. And how is anybody to learn the trade?
That could be regulated by allowing an employer, say he had 20 men, to have three or four apprentices.

3858. You would allow the employer to have a certain number of apprentices, but not the journeymen?
Yes; in the shop where I was apprenticed in the country there were only two journeymen and always five or six apprentices going, and the result was that, when they were out of their time, they were compelled to come to London or some other large town; they had no chance in their own town.

3859. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] What hinders men from joining the society in larger numbers?
I cannot say, unless it is the apathy of which you were told by a previous witness; that might be one reason. I will tell you the contribution in our society, and you can judge whether it is high. For 3 *d.* a week we guarantee to a man legal assistance in case of a dispute with an employer. Should he leave the shop through refusing to accept a reduced rate of wages we guarantee him 15 *s.* a week; and in the event of his tools being burnt by fire, we compensate him up to 5 *l.* That is for 3 *d.* a week; you can judge whether that is high.

3860. Lord *Sandhurst.*] Is there any objection on the part of employers to employ men belonging to the union?
With some, not with others; the better class of employers would rather have society men; they have a guarantee then that they will have the work done in a workmanlike manner.

3861. As a general rule the dread of employers does not act as a deterrent to the men from belonging to the union?
Not as a rule.

3862. Lord *Monkswell.*] In job-settling does your union accept wages under 9 *d.* an hour, or do they make it a rule that the wages should be fixed at that, or over?
Ninepence an hour is the standard for our trade.

3863. You say that you arrange it with the private buyer if you think that he can afford to pay a little more?
That was piece-work; when a man has day-work it would not matter what he was working on.

3864. In piece-work you do your best to keep up the wages to 9 *d.* an hour, but sometimes you will accept less?
Yes.

3865. Earl of *Derby.*] Suppose you succeed in keeping up wages to a certain rate, does it not occur to you that you might thereby aggravate the competition of foreign-made goods?
I do not think so.

3866. You do not think that there could be a successful competition from abroad in the kind of goods that you produce?
I think the English mechanic can well hold his own with any foreign workman.

3867. *Chairman.*] We have had it in evidence that there is a good deal of competition from abroad; is that so in your experience?
In the lower class of shops there is, but in the better class of shops I find a foreigner wants as big a shilling as an Englishman.

3868. I was speaking about manufacturers abroad, on the Continent, and in America?
America of course, to some extent, enters into competition with the English trade. One firm for instance, in Tabernacle-street, have any amount of goods brought over; that is the machining part done in America to be put together when brought to England. On the other hand, Hermann, at Limehouse, has the

the wood brought over in its natural state and the machine work done on the premises here.

3869. At any rate, you are not afraid of foreign competition?
Not in the least; in my opinion it is only where certain goods have to be repeated and repeated that machinery as a rule pays. Though Hermann turns out thousands of suites every year it is scarcely ever that you see one in a shop window anywhere; it is a mystery to me where they all go.

3870. How do you mean that you never see them?
I mean not exhibited for sale, not in dealer's windows.

3871. Do you mean us to infer that they are sold as being manufactured by somebody else?
No, my impression is that when a large contract is made for an hotel it is given to Hermann, and the goods are sent right off the place, and are not shown in the windows for sale to individuals.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. GEORGE ELCOCK, is called in; and Examined, as follows:

3872. *Chairman.*] You are a manufacturer of what?
Carved oak cabinet work.

3873. How long have you been in that business?
I served my apprenticeship for seven years; I worked 14 years as journeyman, and I have been 18 years a cabinet manufacturer to the trade in that special line. I have also during the time when I was a journeyman been president of the West End Cabinet-makers' Society.

3874. Have you got a statement which you wish to make to the Committee?
I have one here roughly written down. Having occupied those positions for the number of years that I have stated, I have watched narrowly the gradual deterioration of the cabinet trade from the time when men were capable of earning fair wages until now when they can scarcely live. I have not myself been particularly affected by the grinding-down process which has been going on, as during nearly the whole of the period I have been in business; I have worked principally for Messrs. Edwards and Roberts, who pay the same prices to-day that they paid 18 years ago for their stock work, and I have never had anything taken off my prices, or allowed a discount to any customer. I have always taken care to tell the customer that my prices were net, and have been able to maintain my own. Therefore my knowledge of the sweating system is through others. For example, a friend of mine, who has been a manufacturer for some years, made a bed-room suite (this is his own personal statement to myself) of new design, and took it to a large house with which he did business. The price he asked for it was 17 *l.*; he was eventually beaten down to 16 *l.*, not daring to take it anywhere else having submitted it to them. When he went to the cashier 16 *s.* was deducted as discount. This suite having been sold, an order was given him for another on condition that an extra tray was put in it at a cost of 3 *s.* Again he got another order, but was to put some extra carving on it, which cost 4 *s.*; and again another addition was made; he had to line the hanging portion which also cost him 4 *s.*; thus reducing the originally agreed price of 16 *l.* to 14 *l.* 3 *s.* He then went minutely into the costs of manufacture, and found he was losing 1 *l.* on each suite; therefore he declined making any more. This is a very common practice of sweating. Another is to get sideboards made a little longer or deeper from back to front, which entails the cutting out of the wood to a great disadvantage, but someone can always be found who has no reputation to lose as regards the making of good work who will make similar articles at even a reduced price by putting inferior materials and work into them.

3875. I must

3875. I must interrupt you to ask you this question. What you are telling the Committee is entirely second-hand, is it not?

Not having been in that special line of business I can only get it indirectly; for the cabinet-making at the present day is so subdivided that one man makes a special article and none others; there are people who make dining-room furniture alone, others who make bed-room furniture, others who make library furniture.

3876. But the Committee cannot take as your evidence what is really second-hand; you do not even state whom your informant is?

I can tell you privately.

3877. If you have anything to tell the Committee about your own branch of the trade and your own experience, we shall be very glad to hear it.

I could give you the names, but these men are in such a position with the firms with which they work that it would be their ruin to give their names publicly, because they would lose their work.

3878. We cannot accept second-hand statements such as you have been giving; have you anything to say that comes within your own experience?

I will speak of my experience then as regards the men who are employed in large firms for the buying of furniture; that has been experienced by myself and others.

3879. Give us your own experience?

The buyer, in my opinion, knows nothing of the internal manufacture of the work; he judges only by outward appearance, and his sole object is to get the goods at the lowest price for his employer, and to also get something for himself. I have known, myself, a salesman to take 2½ per cent. on all orders he gave out, and not always to be content with so small a percentage; even the porters expect a gratuity, and in some houses the principals will not allow their porters to assist in unloading the work, therefore necessitating the poor trade-worker to take men with him to do so. Much of the inferior cabinet work of to-day is nailed together, which it is impossible to detect. I saw myself chests consisting of five drawers, being made for 5 *s.* 6 *d.* each, the only dovetails being those in the drawers, but when decorated they made a very presentable portion of bed-room furniture. I have here a lock (producing it) which is put upon them, the cost of which is 6½ *d.* per dozen.

3880. Lord *Thring.*] How does this bear on the sweating system. We are aware that there are inferior articles of furniture made?

My contention about the sweating system is this: that it is not the man who manufactures the furniture who is the sweater, but it is the large dealer who is the sweater; the sweating begins at the top of the tree.

3881. *Chairman.*] You heard the evidence of the last witness before the Committee as to the evils which he attributed to the existence of these middlemen; have you got anything to say about that?

I consider the middleman to be a man who steps between the customer and the manufacturer, a man who does nothing towards gaining the profit, excepting to sell; a man who knows nothing about the quality of the article with which he supplies his customers.

3882. On that point have you heard what has been said before the Committee by the last witness, and have you anything to add to it?

If you will tell me what the last witness said I shall be able to tell you.

3883. I thought you were in the room while he was examined?

I was sitting at the back, and he spoke low, so that I did not hear all he said.

3884. He objected to these middlemen dealers?

That is my objection; I do not see how you can possibly bring the purchaser into direct contact with the worker.

3885. You think that the producer and the consumer ought to be brought together, but you do not think it is possible to bring them together?
I do not think it is possible to do so.

3886. Then why do you object to the middlemen if it is impossible to do without them?
Because they do not manufacture the work themselves. If they manufactured the things themselves under their own personal supervision, then the workmen would be put in almost direct communication with the consumer, and the quality of the work would be far superior.

3887. Lord *Thring.*] The former witness told us all this?
Then I will refer to a matter in my own experience.

3888. *Chairman.*] You make carved oak work?
Yes.

3889 And have been engaged in that trade you said for 18 years?
Yes.

3890. Is there any change which has taken place in that particular branch of the trade during those 18 years?
There is a change in the importation of foreign work, and my complaint is, that it is being bought by dealers, and sold to their customers as English oak work; whereas, in my opinion, it ought to be labelled as of foreign manufacture.

3891. Have you any proof of that?
You can go into any shop in Tottenham Court-road and find that it is sold as carved oak work of English manufacture unless a direct question is asked, and the majority of customers will not ask any such question.

3892. Do you mean that it is labelled as English work?
No; as regards price it is labelled, but not as regards workmanship, or the country from which it is imported. I would like in all places where work is manufactured that it should bear the name of the maker; that if made by a firm it should bear the name; for instance, Shoolbred, or Jackson and Graham, or if it was manufactured by the workers in connection with Jackson and Graham, or whoever they might be.

3893. You think the maker's name should be on it?
Yes; it was a feature in what was known as the Artizans Exhibition that all the work exhibited should bear the name of the manufacturer if exhibited by some firm.

3894. Do these large houses, as a rule, make their own oak carving on the premises?
They do not; I never knew one to employ a carver.

3895. Do they pretend to?
They do not; they undertake the orders for special work, and get it executed by outsiders, or middlemen.

3896. I do not understand what you complain of in that if they do not pretend to make it themselves on the premises?
But they sell it. I was saying a moment ago of imported work from Holland, brought over in shiploads, and sold by Bonham in Oxford-street, for one place, and afterwards distributed amongst the various customers as English oak.

3897. You said just now that it was not marked as English oak?
It is not marked as English oak, neither is the work that is manufactured in England marked as English work.

3898. Lord *Thring.*] This is how I understand it. You go into a shop and buy goods; what does it matter who made them?
It makes all the difference if the work is not of that substantial character that English carved oak work is supposed to be. For instance, if you buy an imported cabinet the ends are, perhaps, about half-an-inch thick. If you buy an

an English cabinet they are an inch thick. The one will tumble to pieces in a few years, whereas the other will last for generations. It is impossible to go into some of the English mansions and find carved oak work that has been in existence some hundreds of years. I brought a chest up from Shropshire the other day that had been in my own family 200 years; a chest of the same character imported would not last 20 years.

3899. *Chairman.*] Have you anything to say on the other points that have been mentioned before the Committee; as to the payments being made on Saturdays by cheque, for instance?

I know nothing whatever about that. I was going to speak as regards my own particular trade, of what I know of it as regards the work. I have found in trade-working shops that men have to compress their week's work into about four or four and a-half days, that the work has to be finished on a Friday or, at the latest, Saturday morning?

3900. What do you mean by a trade-working shop?

Similar to my own, which is termed the second sweater; the one that works for these finishing establishments where work is given out to a man and he employs other workmen to manufacture that work. The work has to be delivered to these houses on a Friday, or the Saturday (in some cases Saturday), so that they are able to get their money. If it is not delivered in time, as you have had evidence, a large percentage is charged for the advance of money by those houses.

3901. Are you speaking now of your own work?

Yes, of my own work. It necessitates the workmen working all night on Thursday night, and in many cases Friday night; in case the work goes out on Friday the men work all Thursday night to get it out, and, to put it in plain language, the work is sent out red hot. I have seen it frequently being finished on its way to the firm who had already given the order, in the way of using the glass paper or stopping. If a piece of veneer is broken off they have not time to put another piece on, but it is filled up, and in dark wood heel-ball bears an important part in the manufacture in the making up of mitres.

3902. Where do you get your orders?

I have never had to search for orders: I have always had plenty of them without seeking them.

3903. You were complaining just now that you have to work at night?

To get the work out each week, because if it is not finished each week it involves two or three days to finish it in the next week.

3904. You have more work than you can do, in fact?

You have to finish the work by a certain time. If the work goes in on a Friday there is only four days.

3905. Lord *Thring.*] Of what do you complain?

I am complaining of the system.

3906. Of what system?

The system of firms not manufacturing the work on their own premises under their own supervision.

3907. I thought you were telling us you did manufacture work on your own premises?

But I am not a large house furnisher; I am not a Shoolbred; I work for this class of people. My desire is that they should do the work themselves under their own personal supervision, when they would see that the work was properly executed.

3908. *Chairman.*] You say that you get orders which you can complete in the week?

No, my Lord, I did not say that; I said that the orders that are received have to be so arranged that they must be executed in the week; each week must produce a certain amount of work; there must be a certain amount of

work got out each week; if it is not got out in that week it involves one or two days in the next week to really finish it, and then the next week is a spoilt week.

3909. That appears to me to be what I said, that you have got a larger order than you can do in the week?

No, it must be done in the time. The men when they take a piece of work out know how long it will take them almost to an hour to make it; they will undertake to make a chest of deal drawers in a day; they do not allow it to go into the next day; if they do not complete one in a day they will make a point of completing five in a week. I hope your Lordship understands what I mean.

3910. I do not?

I will illustrate it in this way: we will take a bootmaker——

3911. I would much rather you would take your own work and explain that?

Suppose I had an order for a sideboard; I arrange for that sideboard to go in at the end of the week, and I put the men to work upon it, and it is an understood thing when that is put in hand that that sideboard is to be completed that week; then we necessarily sometimes have to work all night to complete that sideboard; if it is not completed it will take perhaps one or two days in the next week to complete it, if it is allowed to go over a certain time.

3912. In other words, you took an order which you could not complete in a week?

We always complete it.

3913. Lord *Sandhurst.*] You work for very large firms, do you not?

I do.

3914. And you complain of this system of giving out the work?

Yes, of the trade generally.

3915. And yet you have never had to search for work; therefore you have been very successful at it, I suppose?

I have been independent of the trade generally.

3916. Lord *Monkswell.*] Do you think you ought to be allowed a longer time?

No.

3917. Lord *Thring.*] What do you represent to the Committee as your complaint?

I represent to the Committee that the firms ought to manufacture their own work instead of giving it out to trade-makers like myself.

3918. Then you would get no work at all?

I should work for the firms.

3919. But I thought you did now?

I should work for them for excellence, and not, as now, to get the money on a Saturday night. A workman takes his work out (these men, like myself), and does not care whether the work is done well or badly so that it passes.

3920. *Chairman.*] You would prefer such a change as would necessitate your being employed by these large houses on their own premises as a workman, instead of being employed in your present position?

Yes. It would be better for the workmen, better for the customers, and better for the houses themselves who get the orders; it would be better all round to dispense entirely with the middleman like myself.

3921. Have you anthing else you object to in the present system?

I desire to make a few remarks regarding the firm of Messrs. Maple, because hey have always been to my mind the one firm ——.

3922. Have

3922. Have you worked for Messrs. Maple?
I have worked for Messrs. Maple; and they have always been, to my mind, the one firm for the cabinet trade who have been the pioneers in the sweating system. They were noted many years ago for the very hard bargains they drove with anyone who wished to sell them anything.

3923. If you have anything to say about it of your own personal knowledge, you can tell us, but not otherwise?
Mr. Maple, senior, has frequently called me to give him a price for sideboards, and given me orders for making them, and I have since found that it was at a considerably reduced price from what was charged by the original maker. This is an everyday occurrence with them. I have felt ashamed of myself in being made the tool of such people, to rob men of their designs, which had cost them much time and money.

3924. I do not understand?
I mean this: that Mr. Maple, senior, has sent to me, and asked me to give him a price to make a sideboard; he has shown me one that has been made by someone else, and he has caught hold of me by the arm and has said, "What can you make two sideboards like that for," and I have, of course, looked at the thing; it is all there before me; I can get the sizes and all the particulars in connection with it; and he has eventually ended by giving me an order for making two of these sideboards. I have made them, and found out afterwards that I was making them at a considerably reduced price from that of the man who originally made it, and whose design it is.

3925. What do you object to in that?
I object to the dishonesty of utilising other people's brains for the benefit of the firm, making me a tool to cut down the prices; I was an instrument in the hands of the firm.

3926. Lord *Thring*.] That is the whole of that transaction, is it?
That is only one of many in that direction. I have another objection with regard to Messrs. Maple. I did a considerable amount of work for them some years ago, and Messrs. Maple gave me an order to make them a buffet. I made this buffet under the supervision of the gentleman who gave me the order; he came and approved of it whilst in manufacture; he saw it the day previous to its delivery, and when delivered Messrs. Maple sent infor some outside people, others in the line, to ask them what they would make a similar article for. Their price evidently being considerably less than my own, Mr. Maple made a slight complaint, and sent me to fetch it back, saying he would not have it, evidently wanting me to come to some terms at a reduced rate. I sued them for it in the county court, and I had to produce the article there, and I was nonsuited on the ground that I had not got a written order. I was put to 8 *l.* cost. My contention is this, that all orders given over 2 *l.* should bear a stamp similar to a receipt stamp, and then it should be illegal for any firm or person to give an order except for 2 *l.* or under without such stamp.

3927. *Chairman*.] Is it your custom to take orders without a written agreement?
It was with Messrs. Maple; and I have never known them to give a written order myself, except in one case. The first thing I ever did for them, I asked Mr. Maple to give me a written order, and he asked me the question if I did not think the firm of Maple was sound enough or good enough.

3928. What I understand you to mean is that you object to the system by which the orders are given out without a written agreement?
Without a written order. Verbal orders should not be given because they are repudiated, by that firm in particular, and the work is in many cases thrown upon the hands of the manufacturer, as this was in my case.

3929. But you think that ought to be made illegal?
Over 2 *l.*

3930. People are not able, you think, to take care of themselves?
They are not able to take care of themselves, and there are many people in my class of trade who get a little bit of wood and manufacture an article, and take it to a house and sell it, and perhaps get an order for two.

3931. You have described yourself as being quite independent of the trade; why did you not ask for a written agreement?
I asked in the first case, and then I became somewhat lax, having faith in the firm of Maple and Company.

3932. Lord *Monkswell.*] About this county court action, I suppose it was a case of your oath against the foreman's oath, or that of some person employed by Mr. Maple?
No, there was no swearing at all in the matter, except my oath. They employed a counsel, and he quoted an Act of Parliament by which it is necessary to have a written order over 15 *l.*; that if you have not a written order you can repudiate it; I was non-suited. The judge expressed his regret at the decision, but that was an end, of course, to the matter. Of course I never went to Messrs. Maple for any more work, nor did anything more for them.

3933. Lord *Thring.*] One or two further questions: You brought an action you say, against Messrs. Maple, for how much?
£. 28.

3934. When was that action brought?
Some years ago.

3935. Cannot you tell us the date?
I cannot; a dozen years ago, I should think.

3936. And in what court was it brought?
The Bloomsbury County Court.

3937. Who was the judge?
I really cannot tell you. The case is reported.

3938. Where is it reported?
I believe, in a paper called the "Cabinet Maker" or "Upholsterer" of that period.

3939. Can you send us a copy of it?
I will endeavour to get it.

3940. But you cannot recollect the year even?
Not at the present moment.

3941. And you say you were nonsuited?
I was nonsuited.

3942. On the ground that there was no written contract?
That it was necessary to have a written contract for an amount exceeding 15 *l.*

3943. You were nonsuited on the ground that you had not got such a contract?
Yes.

3944. Then, in other words, he pleaded the Statute of Fraud?
I do not know whether it was that.

3945. You can furnish us with the report?
I can; I will endeavour to get it.

3946. At all events, you will furnish the Committee with the exact date?
As near as possible, the year and the month.

3947. Can

3947. Can you refer to the records of the court?

I will refer to the records of the court and see if I can get it from there. I may say that they did not dispute giving the order, or object to the quality of the work or anything of that kind; they relied on the statute, that it was over a certain amount.

3948. They relied on the technical point, that there was no written agreement?

Yes, that is so.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Tuesday, 5th of June, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Martis, 5° *Junii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of CANTERBURY.
Earl of DERBY.
Earl of ONSLOW.
Viscount GORDON (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord CLINTON.
Lord CLIFFORD OF CHUDLEIGH.
Lord FOXFORD (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord ROTHSCHILD.
Lord MONKSWELL.
Lord THRING.

LORD KENRY (EARL OF DUNRAVEN AND MOUNT-EARL), IN THE CHAIR.

MYOR WILCHINSKI, is called in, and having been sworn; is Examined, as follows:

3949. *Chairman.*] WHAT is your trade?
Ladies' tailor.

3950. Are you an employer of labour yourself?
Not exactly; I would be called a master man. I take work from a large firm and make it at home myself with the aid of my wife.

3951. You do not employ any workmen under you?
No; only a little girl that runs errands; she takes the work to and from the place I work for.

3952. Do you work for any special firm?
Yes, I do.

3953. And do you take work for individuals; do you execute private orders?
No, none at all.

3954. You understand what is generally known as the sweating system?
I understand what is generally known by it, but my definition would be somewhat different.

3955. Will you let us have it?
My definition of a sweater would be a person that lives on the labour of other persons; whether he takes work and sub-contracts that work, or whether by any other means he manages to live without working, I call that person a sweater. The place I am working for at present I would rather wish to name last, because it may be the cause of my being not actually ruined, but for the season. It is the worst one.

3956. You need not give the name of the firm unless you wish it?
Thank you, my Lord. I wish, first of all, to call your Lordship's attention to a statement I read in a paper, that Poole the tailor had discontinued sweating. That is not the fact, because at the present moment there is a man who gets work out from Poole's, and they well know that he sweats people under him to do this work, pays them very much less than he actually gets; and this man is doing a thriving business, and his name is Vantini, and he lives in Gerrard-street, Soho. (He will not deny any of these statements, because they are very much under what is actually the case). From Poole's, his best firm, where they make the best class of work, he gets gentlemen's trousers to make.

 3957. Is

3957. Is this of your own knowledge?
Yes.

3958. You know him?
Yes; and he gets trousers to make from there, 20, 30, or more pairs a week, besides as many from other firms that do not pay as well. He gives these out to women whom he employs on his premises to make piecework; and for a pair of trousers that he would get 5 *s.* 6 *d.* for, tweed trousers, summer trousers, he would pay a young woman to put in the best part of the work, 1 *s.* or 1 *s.* 3 *d.*; I believe 1 *s.* 3 *d.* is the price of Poole's trousers. He would add to that the labour of a man who would press all these trousers, and shrink them into shape. A young man who has left there I could easily get to come here; he would get no more than a pound a week, working from eight o'clock in the morning until eight o'clock, and sometimes 11 or 12 o'clock at night because they were busy. I have known the case of a young woman, who would be very glad to come here, who worked there, and has taken as much as 28 *s.* of a Saturday for her week's work; but that week's work consisted of 80 hours; and so on. And extras that he gets paid for from the shops he does not pay his piece-workers for. If he has to make a pair of trousers for trying on, for which he gets paid, he does not, or did not up till very recently, pay the piece-workers.

3959. How do you mean he did not pay them?
Because they got for a pair of trowsers 1 *s.* 3 *d.*, and if they had to baste these trousers to try on, they did not get extra for this extra work, but they got these same trousers back afterwards to finish. That is all I have to say about Mr. Vantini and Poole's. And it is a strange thing, that since this sweating agitation has been carried on, not because of its being carried on (I do not suppose that), but since it has been carried on, strange to say, that Poole's have reduced the number of garments given out each week to sweaters, and have instead taken premises where they fit up their own workshops, and employ men who get the work direct.

3960. That man Vantini, I suppose, works in a large workshop?
He does not work himself, besides walking about and bossing the girls he has in his employ.

3961. Does he put out any work?
No, he does not put any work out. He has lately bought a pressing machine, which helps the man considerably who presses the trousers. Of course it does away with a lot of the labour that would require to be done by men. And the system under which he gets people enough into his employ is very simple. He will put a bill in a shop window, advertise, so to speak, that he wants girls to learn the trade; but these girls when they get there are not taught the trade by him or anybody paid by him in his time, but they are taught by the other piece-workers, who have to lose their own time to teach these girls; and these girls later on compete with the others and bring the prices down; girls getting for this 5 *s.* a week, and when they are a little faster 6 *s.* or 7 *s.* a week.

3962. Do you mean that the piece-workers are obliged to teach them?
They are not compelled, but if they did not they would be looked upon with disfavour by the employer, and their work would be curtailed, and they would lose by it. That is all I have to say about Mr. Vantini and Poole's; but as I am a ladies' tailor, I will call your attention, please, to the effect of the sweating system as it is carried on by one of the so-called greatest and finest ladies' tailors in the world, Redferns, who have branch establishments in New York (where I have worked), and in London, in Conduit-street; Cowes, Isle of Wight; Paris, and other places, I believe; also in America, at one of the seaside places in the summer; I think it is Rhode Island.

3963. Is the system pursued by Mr. Redfern peculiar?
Yes, very peculiar, because it is a deceitful system from beginning to end. The ladies, and most of the aristocratic ladies, deal with Mr. Redfern, hardly any other; most of the wives and daughters of the nobility of the country, and princesses.

3964. That

3964. That would not make any difference to the system; I asked whether he did his work differently, or he got it done differently from others in the same trade?

Yes, the system under which it is carried on is this: A lady going to order a costume or habit understands, I believe, that these are tailor-made; but it is a notorious fact that a tailor never touches a bodice that is made by Redfern's; he never sees it. Ladies should first of all find out when they want a tailor-made garment whether it is made by men or women, because these women compete with the men.

3965. Will you explain how it is made?

The dress bodices in a good firm like Curtis, of Sackville-street, and others too numerous to mention, are made by men, because they require much skill and taste; but with regard to the dress bodices as made by Redfern, all the braiding that used to be done by men, and is done by them now in good firms, is done now by girls, some of them making from 8 *s.* a week up to 1 *l.*, making ladies' dress bodices which are supposed to be made by tailors, of course. The same system is carried on by Doré, of George-street, Hanover-square; he does exactly the same thing; and besides that, Doré has habitually employed a sweater by the name of Solomons who lives now in Percy-street Tottenham Court-road; he has employed him during the last 11 years, and gives him out the ladies' work, except the dress bodices, which he has made on the premises by girls much cheaper. He gives out jackets, ulsters, and habits to Solomons, and Solomons goes down to Whitechapel, when he has a rush of work, and gets people who have just landed to come and work for him very very long hours for very little money. I have worked for Solomons myself; I learned my trade there, at least some of it.

3966. About those bodices, do you consider that they are inferior to the bodices made by men?

Much inferior; there is no style in them. One of these bodices made by a girl, if you pick it up, will fall like a piece of rag; there is no form or substance, or shape, or anything in it; it simply fits the lady, and that is all.

3967. Your contention is that it is pretended that these bodices are made by men, and that the same price is charged for them as if they were made by men?

Yes, or much more.

3968. But that they are made by girls, and are of inferior workmanship?

Yes.

3969. Lord *Sandhurst.*] Are these bodices made of cloth?

Yes, cloth and other substances. With regard to riding habit bodices, up to now women have not been found to make these in a way to fit the ladies that wear them; and I contend that these girls are not to blame, but Redfern himself is to blame for wanting to make a bigger profit out of his work than he would be able to make if he employed men. I contend that Redfern and these big shopkeepers are to blame for not employing men in preference to girls; and these girls are used to the detriment of the skilled ladies' tailors of London, who are then forced to go and work for sweaters, because they cannot get work at prices to keep them in good shops, so-called. The system is carried on now by another tailor well known to most gentlemen present, I am sure, as the "Ulster House," Benjamin's, opposite Redfern's, in Conduit-street. The Ulster House people have been habitually during the last 12 or 14 years employing a man named Goldberg, who lives in Whitechapel, I believe it is Brick-lane; and this Goldberg does not live in the neighbourhood, does not employ men in the neighbourhood of the Ulster House; and I contend that these people, good tailors, who live all round Regent-street, and Piccadilly, and Bond-street, and so on, because good tailors' shops are there, must of necessity find very little employment in the good season, none at all in the bad season.

3970. Do you mean to say that this state of things exists because the work is put out to people in Whtechapel?

Yes; and Mr. Benjamin knows full well that the work is being made in Whitechapel,

Whitechapel, and that men in the West End require this work; are in need of this work.

3971. I suppose that he gets the work done cheaper by getting it done in Whitechapel?

I expect so. Mr. Goldberg would, I expect, kick very much if you asked him to show the log. The work made is mostly garments, homespun garments, and ulsters of various titles, which Mr. Benjamin has given them for shooting, driving, riding, and so on, are made in Whitechapel. It is a strange thing that, during the Jews holidays, especially the holiday that comes in the month of September generally, the holidays that begin at the "Feast of Flowers," and go on through the Jewish New Year and Day of Atonement, Mr. Benjamin habitually puts a bill in his window for good tailors, and uses them for this short time, till Mr. Goldberg and these people have got over their holidays or holy-days, and then he humbugs them with the work till they are glad to leave. He has done that to me. He tells them when they come one day, "There is nothing ready; come this evening"; and then in the evening he says, "Come to-morrow," and then the man does not go any more. Every year he does that.

3972. *Chairman.*] You mean that when the Jews who are employed by Mr. Goldberg are not working, on account of their holy-days, then Mr. Benjamin gets in Christian tailors to work for him?

Yes.

3973. And afterwards you say he "humbugs" them?

Yes, afterwards he humbugs them; that is the tailors' phrase.

3974. Lord *Thring.*] He dismisses them, you mean?

No, that would be too honest; he tells them to come for work next day, and then tells them to come another day.

3975. *Chairman.*] Why does he not dismiss them?

He is afraid the men would make a row if he told them straight out, "I do not want you any more."

3976. He makes excuses, you mean?

Yes. There is another shop in Regent-street, Fisher and Son, where I was working. He is in the habit, or he was up till lately (there is a new system since), of employing foreigners, mostly Frenchmen.

3977. What do you mean by "lately"?

A few weeks ago. The workmen he had on the premises, a few Englishmen among them, feeling that the prices paid were not sufficient, sent in a deputation with a list of prices of their own, which were a reasonable list of prices according to their idea, much below the first-class prices, and they asked Mr. Fisher to pay them these prices. Mr. Fisher consented to pay them this price, but began then, not boldly to tell them he would not pay them and that they could go, but began again to humbug them, as I call it; I do not know what other phrase to use; till they one by one went away and left him.

3978. They were piece-workers, I suppose?

All piece-workers. Since that he has instituted another system where he sweats own his own premises, and keeps a Jew to manage the rest of the work-people on the premises; and this same Jew was one of the very men who, as they called it at the time, struck against the low prices that were paid; he has been brought back somehow, or went back, or offered himself.

3979. Just explain what you mean when you say that he has commenced sweating on his own premises?

A jacket or a bodice that he used to pay a man 15 *s.* for making he does not give to a man to make now, but he will give the work to this Mr. Simon to see that others make it in different parts, and the cost of manufacture is reduced.

3980. Instead of dealing directly with the workman he employs an intermediary, a foreman, you mean?

You may call him his foreman or manager.

3981. And

3981. And he gives him the price of the article?
No; he pays Simon weekly for the management of the room. The job does not cost Mr. Fisher so much now.

3982. The jacket is made cheaper because it is sub-divided among a number of people?
Yes, to the detriment of skilled ladies' tailors, who are walking round Regent's-street looking for work. Mr. Fisher, junior, himself asked me to go in the busy time and find him some men from anywhere, to cajole them from other places if necessary, but bring him some men to work, and if they were good men he would pay me at the rate of four shillings for each man that I brought, for my loss of time. I asked him to pay me half a days's wages and I would go and find somebody if I could; but he would not do that, because he said I might go and not use the time in looking for men.

3983. Did you find him any men?
One man; and he said after the man had worked a few days the man was not any good; so he did not give me the four shillings; he said he would give me two shillings, but he has not yet given it to me. He asked another man, a brother-in-law of mine, who would be glad to give evidence. He asked another man, a Frenchman, to send word to his comrades at Paris, that they could get work in Regent's-street, and he would pay the expenses over.

3984. Did he send them word?
He did not do so directly. Of course he was rather ashamed that the other men should know anything of it; but he did put it about among his comrades in London, and they did come over through his instrumentality, many of them not ladies' tailors at all, but simply tailors who could sew, and the rest of us taught them little things, and they got on; and when I was at Fisher's (I left there about 18 months ago, or a little more), I was the only Englishman there; he could not get any others; they would not make the work the way he wanted it for that price.

3985. What were the nationalities of the people there?
French, Polish, and Russian.

3986. Do you mean Polish Jews and Russian Jews?
They did not happen to be Jews; the Frenchmen were not Jews, none of them. I have been in the trade some time and have worked with many nationalities. It appears to me that you do not find a Russian Christian or Catholic a tailor; they are nearly all Jews. There is another firm in Conduit-street, of the name of Marcus. This Marcus opened an establishment in opposition to Mr. Benjamin of the Ulster House, he having sweated for Mr. Benjamin himself. I worked for him at the time Mr. Marcus did, and I remember the day when Mr. Marcus, who now owns a shop, landed in London, a greener from Poland, and I have followed his career up, and now he keeps a shop, and he was a sweater for Benjamin of Ulster House, and other firms; and on his gains, on the money that he had not paid his workpeople, on the unpaid labour of his workpeople, he has now a shop in Conduit-street. He employs on ladies' work mostly his fellow countrymen, Jews and Poles.

3987. What do you mean by Jews and Poles, Polish Jews?
Yes, Polish Jews. There is hardly ever to be found in his workshop an Englishmen; and when he is found there, it is in a very bad time of year, when he cannot get anything better. He does not give the work out; he has it all made in the back of his premises, in a yard at the back of Conduit-street. He pays them prices, some of them working piece-work, much below the price he could afford to pay for the prices he charges the ladies, and much below the prices paid by other firms.

3988. Does he employ men only?
No, as many women as men. Some of them are cleverer than the men, and can work faster.

3989. Do you complain of a man employing women if they do it faster and cleverer?

No, I do not complain of that; I should rather wish to see every woman that can work, and do the same work as a man, get paid exactly the same; but the women can live much cheaper, because they no not look for the luxuries, so called, of men,—beer, tobacco, and so on; they can live cheaper, and they are forced to work cheaper; wages always go down to the subsistence point, as we are told by all the political economists, and the women are used against the men, especially by unscrupulous shopkeepers, mostly to be found among the Jews, I am sorry to say.

3990. You said just now that the bodices made by women were not as well made as the bodices made by men; now you tell the Committee that a great number of these women are more skilful than the men?

Yes, but they do not make the bodices; they make the button-holes in them, and they make them about four times as fast as the men, and consequently get only about a quarter of the price. If I worked fast I could make six button-holes in an hour, but I know women who could make 18 and 20; and he would not offer me a guinea a week; he would have to give me at the least 5 *s.* or 6 *s.* a day; but he would get these women to work at 3 *s.* or 4 *s.* a day, at this branch. Some of them are very fast and very clever. This Marcus, as I said, sweated himself for Benjamin; Fisher, in Regent-street, who has now got two big shops there, sweated himself for Nicoll years ago; Phillips, in Regent-street, in the Quadrant, sweated himself for Nicoll years ago, and out of the proceeds he has got the business he has now; and I contend also that this sweating system, in which you have young girls working with men of all nationalities and of all degrees of intelligence, conduces to their being, later on, (and they are mostly, to my certain knowledge) prostitutes. Most of the young English girls whom we can see in the Strand and Oxford-street every night, are, or have been, tailoresses, and the conditions conduce to that effect. It is well known to all the tailors round Broad-street (that is the colony), Golden-square, all the tailors that work for the Regent-street shops, that their young girls are so; and if they are not so, they are drunkards; it is well known, for they have great trouble to get the women to come in to work on a Monday. The reason I left a shop where I was working by myself, Scott Adie, in Regent-street (there is no sweating carried on there; he has a foreman on the premises who gives the work out to the men who make it all by themselves now) was because I could not make a living. I earned on an average for a year less than 30 *s.* a week; and to pay 9 *s.* a week that I was paying, and keep myself, and wife, and four children, was almost an impossible task. I am myself temperate and do not smoke.

3991. That is the reason you left it; no sweating was going on there; I do not see what that has to do with sweating?

The reason why I am working now by myself at home is that I could not make a living at Scott Adie's, and I am working at home, and will soon, if I am successful, develop into a sweater myself; I cannot help myself; I am either obliged to go and work for a sweater or take work from a shop and get people to come and work for me, and become a sweater myself. I am very sorry, that is the fact; I am obliged either to sweat or be sweated, unless I am content to work for less than I can live on, in one of the good shops, where men do not earn enough to keep them; not the majority; there are some skilful ones who do earn good wages.

3992. Are you a native-born Englishman?

I was born in Hull, in Yorkshire, of Polish parents.

3993. Have you worked in London all your life?

Yes, except that I was in New York two years out of that time.

3994. Why did you go there?

I was working for a sweater here, a man of the name of Wingard, who worked me so long, so hard, that I was discontented, and thought I would emigrate to better my condition.

3995. How

3995. How long did you stay there?
I was there two years.

3696. Did you better your condition there?
From a money point of view I did, but I could not stand their weather there; it would have killed me if I had stayed there much longer; their summer was too hot and their winter too cold for me, a Londoner, and I came back because I was afraid that I or my wife or children would die in the ensuing summer.

3997. About these tailor-made bodices, or rather the bodices which are supposed to be tailor-made and are made by women, you say they are not so well made by women?
No, not so well made.

3998. But you said that certain parts of the work, like button holes, are better made by women?
No, not better; faster, much quicker.

3999. Is that work as well done by men?
Yes.

4000. Will you explain how a bodice is made; what part of it is done by men, and what part by women?
Generally speaking the skilful part is done by men.

4001. What is the skilful part?
Putting the bodice together properly, so that it does not twist, and that the seams of the back go straight; that requires a little skill; and then shaping the collar; that is the most particular part. When a lady has a little collar like that on a riding habit it requires some skill to make a little collar and turn, and the men put in the canvas in the bodice or jacket, French canvas put inside to make it solid, stiff, substantial; it must be put in very skilfully to look nice and fit, and then they turn in all the edges and make the pockets; and then, afterwards, it is given to a girl who will put on tape on the seams for the whalebones to go in, and the lining in most cases is put in by men; it can be done by women. The lining is tacked in by women, and the lining is felled, sewn all round. If there was a girl working in a room they would not give that to a man to do; the girl would do it, and all the other kind of sewing like, and do the padding.

4001*. That would be an ordinary tailor-made bodice, made in that way, partly by men and partly by women?
Yes.

4002. And what you say is, that a number of bodices that are called tailor-made, are made entirely by women?
Yes.

4003. You say that those are inferior?
Yes, the workmanship.

4004. Do not the customers who buy them find out that they are inferior?
They have not found out up till now that they are inferior.

4005. How long has that been going on?
This has been going on, I should say, for 10 or 12 years.

4006. Do you mean that the ladies who buy these goods have not found out in 10 or 12 years that the articles are not as well made as they used to be?
No.

4007. And yet you contend they are not nearly so well made?
Not at all; if you were to ask a lady, she would tell you she would prefer a tailor-made jacket; that is why she goes to Redfern in preference to a dressmaker's, but they are made in exactly the same way; she does not know that.

 4008. I understand

4008. I understand you to say that 10 or 12 years ago these bodices were made by men?
Yes.

4009. And were much superior to those now made by women?
Yes.

4010. But at the same time you say that the ladies who buy these things have not found that out?
They appear to me not to have found it out, else I do not see why they should patronise the houses that they do.

4011. You say that there is a marked inferiority, but that nobody has found it out?
I cannot say nobody; many ladies have objected to dresses that have been made by women, and have consequently gone to tailors to get tailor-made dresses; especially there is Curtis' in Sackville-street, that employs only men, and they make all the bodices, every stitch themselves, and I believe his customers think that they have got a very superior article.

4012. You mean to say that it would be easy to distinguish between a bodice that was entirely made by a tailor and a bodice that was made entirely by women?
Yes.

4013. Earl of *Onslow.*] With regard, first of all, to the evidence that you gave about Messrs. Poole, we had some evidence on the same subject at the last sitting of the Committee, and Mr. Lyons said, in answer to Question 3605, that "up till recently they did employ out-door sweaters, but Mr. Poole himself was not aware of it, though the foreman was, but the men working in that firm are members of the amalgamated tailors, and they petitioned Mr. Poole, and he said, 'I will take it into consideration,' which he did, and I do not think he is giving the work out to sweaters now;" do you agree to that?
No, that is not true; he is giving work out to sweaters now, but not to such an extent, because he has many men working for him with their wives at home who have been working for the firm for years, and the men could not go to work inside, and he gets work at home to make; I do not know whether you call that sweating; but I believe it is not the habit of Poole's foreman now to give out to so many garments as would enable anybody to sweat on it.

4014. Your definition of a sweater is a man that gives the work out; puts it out to other people; but that definition would not apply, would it, to women directly employed by Messrs. Poole, and taking the work to their own home?
There are so many different definitions understood by different people, but the word itself first began to be used by the tailor in the West End of London when some of the shopkeepers, finding it was too expensive to have workshops on their own premises, gave the men the work to make at home; the cost of manufacture was thereby greatly decreased, because the man who worked at home had to get his own room, light, fuel, and machine.

4015. Do you wish to see the abolition of the system, no matter what name it is called by, which would involve taking away from these women the work they now do at home, and dismissing hands who had been in the service of a large firm like Poole's for a number of years?
Certainly not.

4016. Where do the girls work who work for Messrs. Redfern; in their own homes?
No, on the premises.

4017. And you object to these girls working on the premises?
No; I object to Mr. Redfern employing these girls in preference to men.

4018. Do you object because you say that they do the work less effectually?
No.

4019. Why

4019. Why do you object?
Because they are used by Mr. Redfern to reduce the price of work; they may work more efficiently; that is not my objection.

4020. You object to Messrs. Bedfern employing the cheapest labour that they can find?
Yes, if it is to the detriment of skilled workmen.

4021. But, I suppose that anybody going into Messrs. Redfern's shop could see that these girls were working, and would know that girls were employed?
No; there is a commissionaire who stands at the street door, and he will not let anybody go in.

4022. And you say that Messrs. Redfern intentionally mislead their customers, and make them believe that the whole of the work is done by men?
No; I do not state whether they do it intentionally or not; but all I contend is that they do it.

4023. Are you not aware that the reason that ladies go to have their clothes made at a tailor's is not that none of the work should be done by women, but that cutting out and fitting may be done by men?
Yes, but that is really not so.

4024. Do you say that they are not done by men?
Yes; they are in jackets, ulsters, and habits, but not in the majority of dress bodices; the ladies themselves will testify to that.

4025. There is no deceit practised, is there, if the ladies themselves are aware of it?
But the ladies themselves, I assume, believe that men make these things, because when they give their order to Redfern, or Nicoll, or Fisher, or to Richards, in Kensington, they must think that men make them; but they really do not make them, not the dress bodices.

4026. Do you think that they are deceived in that the garments are made up by women; is not the reason that they go to tailors in order that they may be fitted and the dress cut out by men?
That is the reason they go.

4027. And that is done in the case of everything except bodices, I understand?
Yes, to my knowledge; but there are many bodices where the forewoman herself cannot get on with them, and she has to call in the aid of the foreman.

4028. Now you said, did you not, that the work could be done and was done much cheaper in the East End, in Whitechapel, than it would be done by the tailors in the neighbourhood of Regent-street?
No.

4029 What did you say?
That there is a tendency towards that; but there are Jew sweaters and others working in the neighbourhood of Regent-street making the garments for the same price as the men in Whitechapel, and they are under the disadvantage of having to pay more rent than the men in Whitechapel.

4030. Do you say it is purely from ill-feeling towards the men who happen to live in Regent-street that the work is sent to Whitechapel?
No.

4031. What is the reason?
Convenience.

4032. How can it be more convenient to send it to Whitechapel?
There are many Jew sweaters that go round to many shops in the busy time and ask for employment, and say they are good workmen; and many of them cannot work at all; they say they can make any amount of garments very nicely, and they do get them made very nicely on their premises, and we call them

them specials; it is a matter of great convenience to a shopkeeper to know that he has got a man who will work for him all day or all night, or all Sunday or on a holiday. Many firms will refuse an order if a gentleman or lady is going away, and wants a thing promised very quickly; but these firms that have specials will take them, and they will work all day and all night with the aid of their wives; and I have worked myself all day on Sunday for Doré on his premises, within seven or eight doors of St. George's Church, Hanover-square.

4033. Then although they, do they not, take the work cheaper than the tailors in the neighbourhood of Regent-street, they would take it under more onerous conditions?
They do take it cheaper too.

4034. I understood you to say, that at certain times of the year there was a very great demand for coat hands; tailoring hands?
Yes, there is now in ladies' tailoring.

4035. And at that time the master tailors have to pay what price they can; they are obliged to pay the price that is asked?
No.

4036. Then what is the difference between the slack time and the busy time?
Only that in the busy time they give you more work to do; they make you work longer hours.

4037. Of course they earn more wages when they work those longer hours?
Yes, certainly.

4038. Cannot the busy time be, to some extent, set off against the slack time?
To a very little extent, unless you are a sweater; the workers themselves are no better off. When I worked by myself, when I was not helped by anybody and only got what I earned myself, I was never able to keep myself in the slack time with the savings of the busy time.

4039. And is that the case generally throughout the year?
Yes, it is with the West End tailors.

4040. Then however great the demand may be it does not materially raise the price given for their work?
No, it does not raise the price per garment.

4041. You made what I thought rather a sweeping accusation, which I should like you to explain. You said, speaking of the girls employed in the tailoring trade, that most of them either led an immoral life or were drunkards. Now I can understand that if a girl earns very low wages she may seek to increase her wages by leading an immoral life; but I do not see how you make out that if she earns very low wages she can afford to spend money in what you yourself admit is not usually required by women, strong drink and tobacco, and so on?
You misunderstood me. I mean that women are used and employed in preference to men because they can live cheaper, and do not require money for drink or tobacco.

4042. I understood you to say that. If that is the case my question is, how is it that those who do not lead an immoral life are drunkards?
That is what I want to know. They seem to me to want the money more than others who are temperance people. That is the case, that most of the London tailoresses are drunkards, and do not come in to work on Mondays; they are drinking and are in great poverty, and look very wretched, even in a busy time. These are the elderly ones.

4043. Do you say that those who lead an immoral life do so to add to their earnings or from their own predilections?
It is not to increase the earnings; it is from the conditions under which they work with men of al degrees of intelligence, under unhealthy and immoral conditions, and with different languages being spoken, and the jokes well known to

to go on in tailors' workrooms; and it is so that most of the young girls in Oxford street and the Strand, whom I know personally, have been and are tailoresses.

4044. *Chairman.*] I understood you to mean this, that the circumstances under which these girls and men all work together lead to immorality?
Yes.

4045. But not that the women are driven to immorality by lowness of wages?
Not in the tailoring trade.

4046. Lord *Thring.*] You stated that the women are prostitutes. In the ordinary sense of the term that means that they lead an immoral life in order to gain money; do you now say that they do not gain money by it?
It is very difficult to say whether they gain money; but some of them, and many of the youngest of them, do it; they do not do it to increase their earnings, but they do it.

4047. You have accused the women of two vices; you say that the women are prostitutes, but that they do not do it to gain money; do I understand that that is your opinion?
No, that is not my opinion; in fact, I am not in a position to state my opinion as to the reasons why they do it; I only say that the conditions tend to their demoralisation, and they do it.

4048. You said that they were prostitutes; "prostitutes" mean street-walkers; then you stated to Lord Onslow that in your opinion they became prostitutes or street-walkers, not with a view to gain money, and my question is, do you mean to say that those who do practice prostitution do not, as a matter of fact, gain money by their prostitution?
I could not say that.

4049. Then, in answer to Lord Onslow, you said the others were drunkards, and then you told us that the women did not want drink; did you mean that they were drunkards without drinking?
No; I meant to say that it is not generally accepted that a woman requires to go about as men do in public-houses, and, moreover, they do not spend money in tobacco, and, of course, employers find that out.

4050. Can a woman become a drunkard who does not drink?
Certainly not; the drunkards do drink.

4051. But you told Lord Onslow, over and over again, that of the women who were not prostitutes the majority were drunkards, and then you tell us the reason why the women are employed is because they do not drink, and I want to know how the majority of women who do not drink can be drunkards?
That is rather three-cornered; if they do drink they have to do it on the money that they earn less than the men.

4052. Lord *Rothschild.*] You would not allow men and women, I suppose, to work in the same workshop?
Yes, I have no objection to that.

4053. But you said, a few minutes ago, that if women worked in the same shop with men they became prostitutes?
No, not all of them; there are very honest and sober good women tailoresses, but that is rather the exception in the West-end tailors' shops.

4054. *Chairman.*] How many people generally work together, men and women in one room?
I worked in a workshop where there were 15 of us men, and about 25 women; of course that would have to be a large workshop.

4055. I understood you to say that you worked at home?
I do now, but I have been working for sweaters, and inside shops, and all that,

 and

and I could not earn enough when I worked for Mr. Solomons; he employed so many, as I have mentioned.

4056. What are the circumstances under which this work is generally done in an average-sized workshop; how many men and how many women would there be?

Some of them have only two rooms or three rooms.

4057. How many men and women working together?

Four or five, or six.

4058. That number of men and the same number of women, do you mean?

The majority of the tailors that work for shops at home have much less than they would have, perhaps one man and three women. A man like that is called in the trade a single-breasted master; he would get work from the shops; he would not have sufficient accommodation to enable him to do more than would employ what he had.

4059. I do not quite understand what it is you object to; but I gathered from you that you considered that the circumstances under which these men and girls work together conduce to immorality, and that the women go on the streets and take to drink?

Yes.

4060. But I do not understand what it is in the circumstances which leads to that?

Generally the disgusting language and conundrums and anecdotes, and so on, continually going on all day between the men and women; and in these workrooms they are mostly Polish Jews, and German and French, and other men who indulge somewhat.

4061. What remedy would you suggest for that state of things?

I could not suggest any remedy whatever. I have examined many of the remedies put forward by other working men, but I cannot see any that would do. You could not force an employer in Regent-street to employ all the people on his own premises.

4062. Do you mean that bad and obscene language is constantly to be heard in these workrooms?

Yes. I do not mean to say that would be the case with Mr. Redfern's workshop, because men and women are not working together there; they have different workshops for them.

4063. Do they in the workshops generally work separately or together?

Generally together; but in Redfern's, a large house like that, there is some order.

4064. You wish the Committee to understand that where the men and women work together, as a general rule there is so much coarse and obscene language that it leads to the demoralisation of the women who are working?

Yes; and of the men also, who get confirmed drunkards. It is the usual thing for men sitting working together in some of the best firms in Maddox-street and Conduit-street to drink; a man will come in with beer in the morning, and of course, if there happens to be a teetotaler among them it is not very comfortable for him, and he is obliged somehow to help them to drink this beer, and they sit and eat and drink; and many foreigners that I have spoken to object to that, and have gone out to dinner where the Englishmen have not done so, but have sat in the workroom and had their dinner brought to them by a contractor whobrings it there to them, and there is the smell all the time of tobacco and beerand coffee; and then in the evening this beer is brought again to them, and the men who are working there are demoralised; and I left Scott Adie's for that very reason, because I was in company there with men the majority of whom only wanted to drink beer and get a log on Friday night.

4065. Earl

4065. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] In your experience is it not the case that in the best firms men and women always work separately?
In my experience in the best firms there are no women.

4066. But where there are men and women in the same establishment, in the better firms, they work separately?
Yes.

4067. There is probably some good reason for that rule?
Yes; it is because there would be less time wasted in that way.

4068. Is it not probable that there is also this reason, that it is considered undesirable that men and women should work together, for fear of the mischief resulting which you have mentioned?
Yes.

4069. And therefore when they do work together it is not surprising that there is the objectionable conversation of which you have spoken?
Yes; that was carried on to a most unnatural extent in Scott Adie's, but the foreman there objects to women now; he has all men.

4070. You mentioned that the foreigners were apt to indulge in that kind of conversation; in your experience is it not a very common thing with others than foreigners, that when men are congregated together, and there is no restriction on conversation, and it unfortunately degenerates very often?
Yes.

4071. And under those circustances it would not be desirable for any respectable woman to have to work all day where there was a liability to that conversation?
No.

4072. You wish the Committee to understand that you have had reason to observe that there have been objectionable results from that practice, and that women have fallen into bad habits not from mercenary motives, but from that contaminating influence?
Yes, that is so.

4073. Earl of *Derby.*] I am not sure that I understand what you said about the employment of women; do you object to it altogether in occupations where they come into competition with men?
No; I do not object to their working at all; I object to their being used against men because they can work for less wages.

4074. You object to their being used against men; that is to say, to their being employed in competition with men?
No; I would not like to take the employment away from women; I would much rather see them much more paid than they are; but I object to the employers employing them for that special purpose of getting the same labour from them much cheaper, to the detriment of the working man.

4075. That is exactly what I asked you; you object to their being employed where they compete with men, because they work cheaper?
No; that would mean that I had an enmity against the women, whereas it is only against the employer.

4076. You do not complain that they work less efficiently than men, but you say that they work cheaper?
Yes.

4077. And that is what you object to?
I do not object to their working cheaper; the poor people cannot help themselves; it is the well-known law that wages come down to the level upon which they live; they are obliged to take it.

4078. Did you not say they could live cheaper than men, because they did not drink or smoke?

Yes; and because they do not take, as young men do generally take, young ladies out and spend money on them.

4079. They live more frugal lives, and more temperate lives, you mean?
Yes.

4080. And that is what you object to?
No; I would like to see the men take a lesson from them in that respect. I object to women being used to make more profit for an employer against men, who must necessarily lose by being unemployed because of women; and in other cases the women themselves are thrown out of employment by the introduction of machinery. I do not object to the women; I would be very glad to see the time when women would be on the same footing as men in every respect.

4081. But I understood you to say that it was in consequence of their greater temperance that they could live more cheaply, and therefore they could underbid the men in the demand for labour?
They do so.

4082. Then if men were to live in the same manner, with equal temperance, would they not be then on fair terms?
But they could not.

4083. Why not?
There are many things that a man requires that a woman does not.

4084. Including liquor and tobacco?
Many of the men are teetotalers, and do not smoke. I myself do not smoke and am a teetotaler, and I believe in everything that will tend to make me better off; but still I understand that although the more I work the more I shall get for it, at the same time the more I receive in wages the more my employer is receiving out of me; every pound I earn there is more per cent. going to him. I do not say it is his fault, or that he can help himself, but it is so.

4085. But have you any practical remedy to suggest; do you propose to forbid the employment of women in any branches of trade?
No, I have no practical remedy, and I contend that there is no practical remedy. I have considered the remedies put forward by men of different religious opinions, and of different political opinions, and by some of no religious or political opinions, and I have found them all wanting; there is nothing that goes to the root of the matter.

4086. Does it not all resolve itself into this, that there is too great competition among the labourers; that there is more demand for employment than there is employment to be given?
That is actually the case; but that is not caused, I contend, by the people being too many. I contend that if a machine is introduced that will do the work of 300 people, these 300 people will be thrown out of employment, whether they are all Malthusians or not; and machinery is used to-day to the detriment of the workers. I do not say that the capitalists and employers can help this; but it is so. I can only suggest that the working men should be educated.

4087. Has there been any considerable increase in the employment of machinery in tailoring in the last few years?
No, not in our trade; but there are men who can do everything on a machine without any tacking by others; that has increased.

4088. But I presume you do not wish to limit the application of machinery?
No, I only wish to see it used for the benefit of everybody.

4089. You have no practical remedy to suggest for the state of things you have described?
No; I contend that there is no practical remedy but to educate the working men, so that they will co-operate together for the benefit of the whole.

4090. Has

4090. Has co-operation been tried in this particular trade?
Yes, I believe it has been; but not the co-operation I mean. I do not mean to co-operate together for profit, because this profit has to be wrung from the people who deal with them.

4091. But you are aware that there are co-operative societies on a very great scale?
Yes.

4092. Have they been applied to the business you refer to?
Yes, the Rochdale ones; but there is no difference between the Rochdale co-operators and the gentlemen who form the shareholders of the Civil Service stores; they share the profits between themselves.

4093. Lord *Clinton.*] I wish to ask a question about the wages given by sweaters. You said that a sweater was employed by Mr. Poole who got 5*s.* 6*d.* for a pair of trousers, and you said he gave 1*s.* 3*d.* to the woman who made them up?
To the woman who did her share of making them up.

4094. Something else to a presser?
Yes, and something else to a machinist.

4095. How much does that come out for the workpeople?
I should say 50 per cent. to the workpeople.

4096. And 50 per cent to the sweater himself?
Yes; he does nothing but superintend.

4097. Does he supply anything, the thread?
Mr. Poole gives him the silk to sew with; he may have to buy soap that Mr. Poole is not aware he uses, very likely to make the bottoms stick; but the sweater has to find the stove and gas, and the tables, and the chairs, and the sleeve boards, and the pressing machine he has got, and he will have to pay rent for the room.

4098. Do you think, finding all that, he still has 50 per cent. of the 5*s.* 6*d.*?
Yes; you would see that if you were to see the interior of his house; it is fitted up beautifully.

4099. Is it a factory where he has the work done?
It is a private house in Gerrard-street; it is worse than a factory; I have known a young girl go in there at six and work till eleven at night; she is consumptive, and she is half blind too.

4100. And that work is going on, you say, at a private house?
Now.

4101. And there is no inspection?
No; if there was inspection they would find young girls there. And he works also for Miles of Brook-street, Hanover-square, but that is a cheap place. And bribery went on at Miles' a few years ago to a great extent.

4102. *Chairman.*] What do you mean by bribery; who bribed who?
Mr. Miles employed then a Mr. Kibby, and he had the control of all the work after it came down from upstairs where it was cut out and fitted on; and he got this work to give out to sweaters; and one sweater where I was apprenticed, Mr. Newman, bribed this Mr. Kibby, and gave him once, to my certain knowledge, a diamond ring; at another time took a house at the seaside and kept him there two weeks during the vacation, and bribed him in other ways that nobody would know of, and got most of the work at that time.

4103. Do you mean to say that it is a general rule in the trade that the sweaters, the masters, bribe the foremen?
It is not a general rule to bribe them openly, because you will never get one Jew to confess that he bribed a foreman, but you will get many foremen who would be sorry to come to a place like this and admit that they have taken bribes. It is not in the shape of giving a sovereign in their hand or so; it is in other ways.

4104. In your opinion they are more or less bribed?
Yes; there is bribery by taking the foreman to a theatre, or taking him home and giving him a good supper, and taking him home and drinking with him.

4105. Lord *Monkswell.*] When you say that girls in the tailoring trade are prostitutes, do you mean that they go with any man, or that they take up with some one man?
That they go with any man.

4106. That the majority of them absolutely go on the street; you do not mean that they live with some one man who works in the shop?
No. I do not say the majority of them, but many of them; and that was carried on to an alarming extent; it was carried on the majority of the time I was at Scott Adie's by two women there, and, thanks to a new foreman, the women were sent away. They were very disreputable because they were in the room with the men, and heard all the disgusting anecdotes and songs.

4107. Lord *Sandhurst.*] You said in one case you had worked all Sunday?
Yes, I was working day-work for a sweater, Wingard.

4108. You did more work and you got more?
He told me if I came on a Sunday and worked he would pay me 8*s.* for making those ladies' ulsters, and I worked there, within seven or eight doors of St. George's, Hanover-square, on Sunday.

4109. This was extra work and extra pay?
Yes, on a Sunday I was working day-work.

4110. But that day's work was not included in the pay you got for the rest of the week?
No.

4111. Lord *Rothschild.*] Had you worked on the Saturday also?
I had worked on the Saturday previous; but I went on the Sunday to oblige him.

4012. *Chairman.*] Do you know many cases where Christians work on Sundays?
No, I do not. It is a rule for Christian tailors to do it when they have very particular work, work that is wanted in a great hurry and must be done.

4013. I asked you whether you knew any cases where Christian tailors work on Sundays, and you said, "No."
No. It is the rule, though I could not tell you of any individual cases.

4114. I meant whether, to your knowledge, the thing occurred?
Yes, it does so among Christian tailors. I would not say that a Christian tailor does it because he likes to work on Sundays; I believe he has an objection.

4115. I want only to know the fact?
Yes, it is the fact.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

WILLIAM JOHN PRICE, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined as follows:

4116. *Chairman.*] WHAT is your trade?
A tailor. A journeyman tailor.

4117. Do you employ other men?
No.

4118. You do work yourself?
Yes; working in the West End.

4119. Have

4119. Have you been employed at taking in, and putting out, work for large houses?
Yes, in the East End. I was engaged at Alfred Hollington's, in Aldgate, to give out the work and take it in, to be made by the Jews.

4120. What do you mean by giving out the work and taking it in?
The work was cut out upstairs by the cutters, and came to me in bundles to be given out, sometimes six rolled up in one bundle, and as many as two hundred in one line of cloth.

4121. Then you had to give it out?
I had to give it out to the Jews to make.

4122. But you had to arrange the price?
No, they were Mr. Hollington's prices.

4123. You were only responsible for giving it out?
Yes, and seeing that it was made and brought in satisfactorily.

4124. Were you paid regular weekly wages for that?
Yes.

4125. You were not acting as a middle man yourself?
No.

4126. We have had it in evidence that the large manufacturers give out their work very irregularly, and that they do so on purpose, and that in slack times they will not give out a certain quantity of work to be done every day, but keep it back and then give it out, and order it to be made up in a very short time; and that in consequence the men have to work very long hours; is that so. To your knowledge is the work purposely held back?
No, our business was to get it out as soon as it came, and get it in as soon as we could.

4127. Have you got any statement of your own you would like to give the Committee?
No, no particular statement, only as to the prices they were paid; I thought they were very bad. The lowest price they paid for a coat was 5*d.*, and the highest price was 3*s.* 6*d.*; 3*s.* 6*d.* was the highest price for what they called a gentleman's covert coat; a riding coat with eight or nine rows of stitches round the cuff, and seven or eight all round the bottom, with a tab and collar and five pockets.

4128. The price for that you say was 3*s.* 6*d.*?
3*s.* 6*d.*; then the makers had to find their own sewings.

4129. I suppose you have no knowledge of how that was divided by the sweaters?
No, I do not profess to know anything about it.

4130. Have you any knowledge of the way in which Government contracts are carried out?
We had a large contract in the house where I was employed; 400 Government coats for discharged soldiers; they get these coats presented to them on their discharge. We paid 3*s.* 6*d.* or 4*s.* 6*d.* (I forget which, but my impression is that it was 4*s.* 6*d.*) on making a sample, but when the bulk came in we paid 2*s.*

4131. I do not quite understand?
The sample that had to go to Pimlico to the Government Factory to be examined for this contract for the 400, was of superior cloth and of superior make; but when the bulk of the 400 were given out, they were given out at 2*s.* each, with inferior cloth and inferior linings.

4132. Where did this contract come from?
From Pimlico, from the stores there; that is where they were sent to when they were finished.

4133. If I understand you, you made a sample at 3 *s.* 6 *d.*, but an inferior article was supplied?
The bulk was made at 2 *s.* each, long overcoats for discharged soldiers.

4134. Was this order put out?
Yes, sent out to the Jews to be made.

4135. It passed through your hands?
Yes, all passed through my hands; that is the only Government order that we had.

4136. Do you mean the only order that they had from the Government at all?
The only order that they had while I was with them from the Gavernment.

4137. How long were you there?
Six months.

4138. Do you know how they obtained this order?
No, I do not.

4139. Do you know whether there is anything like favouritism or any bribery in giving out orders?
Yes, it is carried on to a great extent in the wholesale line.

4140. Perhaps you will explain?
When I was in my position, if you gave work out to a certain man, the more you gave him the more compensation you had if you liked to take it.

4141. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] Commission, you mean?
Yes, commission.

4142. *Chairman.*] What is your position called technically in the trade?
Passer, simply to pass the works.

4143. What you mean is, that a sweater getting large orders from the passer, very generally gives him compensation in money?
Yes, commission.

4144. How are these sweaters paid?
They are paid every day in that house, except Saturday; we sign the check, the number that is brought in, and they go down and get their money.

4145. Were they very large orders?
Yes.

4146. What do you call a large order?
I have taken in as many as 200 coats from one man.

4147. What would be the value?
We paid him 1 *s.* each.

4148. What would be the value of the checks?
The checks were simply checks of the number of the garments that they had brought in; I had to sign it that I received them; then they took the check down to the counting house and got paid.

4149. Have you been a passer in any other house except this?
Yes, I was in a house in Manchester, in John Harding's.

4150. Not any other in London?
No, not in London.

4151. Lord *Thring.*] I do not quite understand with respect to these samples; you say that when the house got a large order it got two sample coats?
Sample coats were made.

4152. By the firm?
Yes.

4153. And

4153. And they were sent to the Government?
Yes.

4154. And thereupon the samples were returned approved?
Yes.

4155. And then you ought to have worked up to the samples?
Yes.

4156. But then I understand you, that instead of working up to the sample they worked to such an inferior extent as the difference between the value of 3 *s.* 6 *d.* a coat and 2 *s.* a coat?
Yes.

4157. In other words the Government was defrauded of 1 *s.* 6 *d.* in each coat?
Yes, that is it.

4158. Did you pass these inferior coats as being up to sample?
That had nothing to do with me; I had to see that they were made right for the 2 *s.*; that was all my part of the business.

4159. Then it was not your part of the business to investigate the quality of the coat?
No, only to see that they were made satisfactorily.

4160. How could they be made satisfactorily if not made up to sample?
They were made passable for the 2 *s.*; I know that they were not made so well as the one at 3 *s.* 6 *d.*

4161. The firm contracted to make coats up to 3 *s.* 6 *d.* samples; were orders given to you to pass coats 1 *s.* 6 *d.* a coat worse?
No.

4162. Then, when these coats came to you why did you pass them?
Because I thought they were made quite well enough for the 2 *s.*, and they were.

4163. The orders given to you were that you were to pass 2 *s.*, not 3 *s.* 6 *d.* coats?
Yes.

4164. Then you knew at that time that the firm was defrauding the Government of 1 *s.* 6 *d.*?
Yes, I was aware of it.

4165. *Chairman.*] Your business was to see that you had proper value for the 2 *s.*?
Yes.

4166. Lord *Thring.*] When these inferior coats were returned to the Government did they not pass under the inspection of anyone?
That I cannot say; no doubt they were under inspection at Pimlico, and passed there, because they were not returned from there.

4167. Four hundred inferior 2 *s.* coats were passed by the inspecting officer, so far as you know, without any one of them being returned?
Yes.

4168. Earl of *Onslow.*] You said that what you called compensation was often paid to the person who gives out the work, in order to secure work for certain individuals; is such compensation paid in order that indifferent work may be passed by the passer?
No, I do not believe that; but what they pay the commission for is for the quantity.

4169. Then the man who can pay the biggest commission is the most likely to secure the work?
Yes.

 4170. Therefore,

4170. Therefore, it amounts to the same thing, does it not, as doing work for a less sum?
Just the same.

4171. Is the firm aware of the custom in the trade to give commission?
Yes, they are quite aware of it.

4172. And the firm do not trouble themselves about that?
Not a lot; but if it is too open they discharge a man for it.

4173. If it is found out, in fact?
Yes.

4174. Did you see the contract that Messrs. Hollington sent in to the Government?
No, not the written contract.

4175. Do you know whether the contract contained what is called a factory clause?
No, I do not know anything about that?

4176. Do you know that, as a matter of fact, there is a clause in Government contracts which requires those who accept them to do the work in a factory, and not to put it out to sweaters?
Yes, I know there is a clause.

4177. Do you know whether upon this occasion any penalty was exacted from Messrs. Hollington for not having made the clothes in a factory?
No, I am not aware of that; I do not think so.

4178. Do you know whether such a thing is often done?
It is always done.

4179. A penalty exacted?
Yes, if it is found out; they are very strict.

4180. But is it a common thing for work to be put out to the sweaters without its being found out?
Oh, yes.

4181. It is done by other firms besides Messrs Hollington?
Yes.

4182. I suppose there is a great deal of competition for Government contracts, is there not?
Yes, a great deal.

4183. Then how is it that a firm or individual, finding that his competitors have put out work to the sweaters contrary to the factory clause, does not give information to the Government?
I cannot answer about that.

4184. Do you know any case of its being done?
No.

4185. Lord *Rothschild.*] What profit had Messrs. Hollington in that case?
I could not tell.

4186. Earl of *Limerick.*] You do not know at what price the contract was taken from the Government?
No.

4187. Only that you had the coats made up at the price of 2*s.*?
Yes, the bulk was made at 2*s.*, and they had to find the sewings.

4188. And that the sample coats sent in cost 3*s.* 6*d.* or 4*s.* 6*d.*?
Yes.

4189. Was not there some person at the Pimlico Factory that passed the goods when they were sent in?
There must have been; they were passed there after I passed them.

4190. But

4190. But you know nothing about that?
No.

4191. *Chairman.*] You said just now they had to find their own sewings?
The basting thread, the thread to sew the buttons on, and sew the pockets and seams.

4192. Earl of *Limerick.*] About what date was it that this happened?
March this year, 1888.

4192. These coats were passed by the Government Pimlico Department?
Yes.

4194. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] You said that the price of the making of the sample was 3 *s.* 6 *d.* or 4 *s.* 6 *d.* with a certain kind of cloth?
Yes.

4195. Who provided that cloth?
Mr. Hollington.

4196. Who provided the inferior cloth; did that come from Pimlico?
I cannot say.

4197. You do not know where it came from?
No; it came from somewhere. The price paid was bad.

4198. When you say the price was bad, was it bad relatively, lower than other people pay?
Yes. What I thought at the time, when I was passing these coats, was that he might have paid 3 *s.* 6 *d.* for the bulk as well as the sample, for they were in fact ulsters.

4199. Those 5 *d.* coats; what would you say they were worth?
They were worth 1 *s.* 6 *d.*, I should think, because they were more difficult to make; we gave 1 *s.* for the samples.

4200. There were plenty of people ready to make them for 5 *d.*?
Oh yes, we could have got them made for 4 *d.*

4201. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] A sample would naturally cost somewhat more than a whole order for coats. If you wanted a sample to send in for competition, in consequence of its being a new style of coat, would not the first coat cost more to make?
We gave a shilling for those cheap samples.

4202. And a sample always is more?
Yes, always more.

4203. You had the giving out of the work?
Yes.

4204. And did you give out more work upon any one particular day of the week than upon another?
Yes, we generally gave a lot out on Wednesday and Thursday.

4205. Why was that; was that because it was cut out in the factory?
Yes.

4206. They started with the cutting out on Monday?
Yes.

4207. *Chairman.*] Have you often known goods returned by the Government as not being up to sample?
Not in that house.

4208. Have you had great experience on that matter?
No.

4209. You cannot say whether it is a common practice or not?
No.

4210. Lord *Sandhurst.*] The result of your experience is, that the factory clause in these contracts is almost invariably evaded?
Yes.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

5th June 1888.

MR. FREDERICK SAMUEL MIERS, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

4211. *Chairman.*] WHAT is your trade?
I am a Boot Manufacturer.

4212. Have you studied what is commonly known as the sweating system?
I have; I wrote a pamphlet upon it about two years ago for the purpose of putting the system before the Boot and Shoe Manufacturers' Association, of which I am a member.

4213. What do you understand by the sweating system?
The employment of subordinate workpeople by a middle man, who gets work in wholesale quantities or in any quantities from warehouses, and gets this work done by this subordinate labour at low prices under conditions of exceedingly long hours and in unsanitary workshops.

4214. How long have you been in the trade?
Ten years as a manufacturer.

4215. Has the trade changed much during those 10 years as regards the sweating system?
I think there is a great deal more cheap work done, a great many more cheap goods sold than there used to be. I state that from what I have seen in shops throughout the country in my travels.

4216. What kind of goods do you manufacture?
A medium class goods.

4217. Do they go abroad or are they sold at home?
Some go abroad and some to the home trade.

4218. When did this sweating in your trade begin?
I believe that it has been in the trade ever since I have been in it.

4219. That is 10 years?
Yes; I have heard of it ever since I have been in it.

4220. Is it getting worse or is it getting better?
I think it is getting worse; that there is more work made by sweaters under the sweating system than there used to be.

4221. Do you manufacture all your own goods in your own place?
No.

4222. You put some out to the sweaters also?
No, I do not employ any sweaters at all.

4223. How are your goods manufactured?
They are manufactured by giving them out to the workpeople, that is to say, certain portions of it. I would like to explain that the boot trade in London is generally carried on by portions of the work being done inside the factories, but other portions being done outside the factories. That is not the case in every factory, but it is in most factories in London; and those portions of the work that are generally given out outside are given out in my factory.

4224. What portion of the work is that?
The machine closing, the lasting, and the finishing.

4225. And that you say in your factory is not given out to sweaters, to middlemen of any kind, but is given out direct to the workmen?
Not to what I have called sweaters. I must state this so as to elucidate more clearly what I mean by that: that machine closing in London is done almost exclusively by middlemen, or middlewomen, whichever it may be, who employ subordinate labour; but they do not employ these people for such long hours nor in unsanitary workshops, as I have mentioned is done by the sweating system as I understand it.

4226. To

4226. To what do you attribute the rise of the sweating system?
I should think that it is caused to a great extent by the desire to compete with low-priced foreign goods; I should think that it is an outcome of that really.

4227. And why do you object to it?
I object to the conditions under which the middlemen get the labour performed.

4228. You mean the insanitary conditions?
Yes, and the long hours and the unfair division of the wages.

4229. You object to the middleman?
Yes, I object to the middleman; not merely because he is a middleman, but I object to this sweating middleman, who gets things done under unfair conditions.

4230. Can you suggest any remedy, or have you any idea of any remedy for these evils?
Yes; I think that if it could be arranged that where the sweating system was shown to be of the character that I state, and acknowledged to be objectionable, an Act might be framed, called, say, the Sweating Act, which might provide that trades where this system prevailed should have the Sweating Act applied, and which should provide for the remedy of these specific evils, and should state, for instance, that men taking out work from factories in these special trades should not be allowed to employ assistants, and should not be allowed to work more than, say, 12 hours a day, and of course should have to work in sanitary places; and if an Act like that could be applied to certain trades, even in certain towns, or even to certain manufacturers, if necessary; in fact, as little or as much as it might be desirable, it would prevent the system growing even where it perhaps now does not at present exist. Another remedy I would suggest is, the registration of all workshops where any work is done, even though the work may be done by a man with his wife or child, or with his wife and children; and those registered workshops should be put under the Factory Acts, which I think would be beneficial, for the reasons that even though they are wives and children, they need just as much the care of factory inspectors as any other factories and workshops. I would also suggest, that in the event of legislation not being able to cope, probably, with these difficulties, the onus of a deleterious system such as this might be put, probably, upon the girls of any special trade, which might on its part put a great responsibility upon the trade associations existing, and ask them to co-operate with them in endeavouring to eliminate any vices or evils that might be recognised as such.

4231. You say that in your own case you do not put out any work to sweaters?
Not to sweaters.

4232. But, of course, in many other cases in your trade work is put out to sweaters?
In many other cases it is.

4233. Is there any advantage attaching to putting out the work to sweaters?
The advantage is that a lower class of work altogether is got up in the boot trade by the people who employ sweaters.

4234. I mean, what advantage is it to the manufacturer to put out his work to sweaters?
He could not get this class of work done by anybody else than sweaters at the price he pays to sweaters for doing it.

4235. Then it is a special kind of work?
Almost so; nearly always.

4236. Could you get your work done by sweaters if you wished?
No; I could not get the quality of workmanship in my work, that I require, done by sweaters?

4237. Now, the remedies that you have suggested would possibly have the effect of putting an end to this system?
Yes.

4238. In that case, in your opinion, would it not be probable that we should lose the whole of the trade of the manufacture of that kind of boots?
Of course that is a thing I have thought about, and it seems to me that if there is a great evil in a trade we must be satisfied to sacrifice some interests of manufacturers rather than allow the evil to continue.

4239. You think it is probable, or at any rate possible, that that trade would be lost to this country altogether, and the boots made abroad?
I do think that a great deal of it would go away and be lost.

4240. Have you turned your attention at all to the effect of the arrival of what are called "greeners"?
Yes.

4241. How does that affect the trade, do you think?
I am bound to say that the more of this foreign immigration that comes into this special trade, the more likelihood there is of the sweating system increasing.

4241*. Do they arrive in large numbers to your knowledge?
I only know that from the newspapers.

4242. You have no personal knowledge of it?
No.

4243. You have nothing to say on that point?
I have no personal knowledge of it.

4244. Do you employ mainly Jews or Christians?
As it happens I do employ mainly, almost exclusively, Christians; that is simply because it happens so; I have no objection to employing Jews.

4245. Is it the case that some branches of the trade are carried on principally by Christians, and others principally by Jews, or are they all mixed up together; are Jews principally employed by the sweaters, for instance?
Are you speaking of the sweater as the middleman sweating master?

4246. Yes?
I believe they are principally employed by them; but it is fair to say that there are also a great many Germans and some Christian men who are also employed by them.

4247. As I understand, one of your suggestions is that every workshop, every room where work is carried on for a profit, should be registered as a workshop?
Yes.

4248. And you also suggest that the hours of adult male labour should be limited?
I do.

4249. Do you think it possible that that should be done, and that it should be confined to the sweating trades?
I thought it was too large a question to expect that you would be satisfied to interfere with the freedom of adult labour, excepting proper cause could be shown for believing that there was a necessity for it, and therefore the idea occurred to me that probably such an Act could be applied to those special trades, even in special towns where it could be shown that there was an absolute necessity for interference.

4250. You think that is practicable?
I should think so.

4251. I suppose you have no personal knowledge of the conditions under which these people work?
Yes; I have been to see them. I know that they live in a very insanitary condition; I know that their lives are miserable lives; I know that they earn as

as a rule very little money, although when they have been over here for some time they do get to earn more money, sufficient, but even then they have to work 16 and 18 hours a day in order to earn as much as an ordinary man working on other systems would earn. I know that they are frightened of their masters, and that they are kept in ignorance as much as possible, both of the language and of civilisation, as a matter of fact, so that as long as possible they may be taken advantage of.

4252. How long is it, do you suppose, before a foreigner becomes tolerably acquainted with the English language?

It depends a great deal upon himself; whether he is clever enough to get away from it. Some men are 12 months, some men are two years; but the knowledge of English in itself will not be sufficient for him to extricate himself from his conditions; he must also get to learn a certain portion of the work, which his master tries to keep from him, and does himself as a rule.

4253. That is the knifing, is it not?

Yes, the knifing of the work; and then the lasting also; the lasting up of the work, the really more skilled portion, if it may be called skilled since the knife is used in it, but the least laborious work.

4254. There is very little combination among the working class in your trade, we understand?

That is growing a little. There is at present a society of the master sweaters, and also a society of the journeymen sweaters, but the society of the master sweaters is larger at present even than that of the journeymen sweaters, although of course there are many more journeymen than masters.

4255. The two societies being opposed to each other in their interests, I presume?

Each society has to guard its own interest as much as possible.

4256. How do you account for the fact that the workmen appear to be so little able to combine, and do anything for themselves?

You mean the journeymen. I think it is that they are kept under strong surveillance from their masters; that is the impression that was made upon me by every shop I visited. The conversation is always conducted in a foreign language, and certain men only are appealed to, who, one could almost feel sure, are bound to answer what the master directs.

4257. In fact they are intimidated; they are afraid?

They seem afraid.

4258. Would not there be very little use in men combining if there is any large number of arrivals of what are called "greeners;" they naturally would not belong to the association?

Quite so.

4259. Is that your opinion, that there would be very little use in men combining?

I do not think that they have at present found that this combination has been much use to them, and I believe (this I am also only told from the secretaries) that the masters' association has 200 members in it, and the journeymen's association has at present only 150.

4260. Do you know at all whether these foreign immigrants arrive generally in a destitute condition?

I only know of their arrival by the papers; I have never seen any of them arriving. I have seen them in these workshops and I have seen them in the streets; I have seen them over and over again and they certainly look very miserable, very dreadful.

4261. As I understand, you object to what is commonly called the sweating system from humanitarian motives?

Yes.

4262. You admit that any legislation interfering with it might have the tendency of driving a certain portion of the trade out of the country?
I think it would be likely to do so.

4263. And what would you propose to do to meet the case of those who have embarked their capital or work in that part of the trade, and who might be ruined if it were driven out of the country?
I think that the people who do that trade do other trade as well; I am not aware that there are many manufacturers who confine themselves exclusively to that trade, so that it might ruin anybody; I am speaking of the boot trade.

4264. Among your remedies you have not made any suggestion about foreign immigration; I presume you do not consider that an important factor in the case?
It seems to me that it would be a little un-English for us to interfere with immigration after the pride we have seemed always to take in stating that our shores are open to everybody.

4265. Earl of *Onslow.*] Would you charge any fee for the registration?
A nominal fee, I think, could not be objected to if it were of any service in carrying out the arrangement.

4266. How small a fee do you think these people would be able to bear without feeling it very harshly?
Really that is a matter that I have not well considered, but I should say off-hand that a shilling a year could not hurt anybody, as a rule.

4267. And would you inflict a penalty for non-registration?
Yes, I would inflict a heavy fine in order to make people understand that it was an important matter.

4268. And would you have the list of registered places exhibited anywhere to public inspection?
That I have never thought of before; but the idea that occurred to me as being the simplest way of registering would have been at the tax offices, where, I believe, all houses are registered, as it were, and I thought that might be an easy method of registering rooms.

4269. What is the object, in your mind, of the registration which you propose?
The object of registration is that all rooms where work is done may come under the Factory Acts.

4270. Then you do not think that it is necessary for the workers that they should know whether they are working in a registered room or not?
Yes, I think it would be a very good plan if every registered room were bound to have a registered number upon it, or some evidence of its having been registered.

4271. So that if a person works in a room he may at once see whether it is a registered room or not?
Yes.

4272. On whom would you throw the responsibility of registering, on the landlord or the occupier?
I thought it was necessary to put it on the occupier. It would be difficult, I think, to ask the landlord to be responsible for doing it.

4273. And you would extend it, I understand, to all rooms in which any work is carried on for a profit?
Yes.

4274. Then I think I understood you to say that you would prohibit the taking out of any work by any person who employed assistants?
That was how I would frame this Sweating Act that I speak of.

4275. Then do you mean to say that you would only allow a man to take out work upon which he proposed to work himself?
Yes.

4276. Then

4276. Then you would endeavour to prohibit the existing practice of a man taking out a certain number of boots and doing part of the work, the knifing himself, and the lasting and finishing by assistants?

Only where this sweating system was shown to have become an evil entailing the necessity of applying the Sweating Act. I would not do so in other trades where the necessity of applying the Sweating Act had not arisen.

4277. Do you mean to say in each individual case or in each individual trade?

In each individual trade or case as might be required. I thought that this Sweating Act might be applied to a larger or less extent as occasion demanded. If it were decided that the boot trade, the clothing trade, and the furniture trade of the East End of London had developed into such a state of the sweating system as to cause the application of the Act to be deemed necessary, then the whole of those trades in the East End of London would have it applied; but if it could only be shown that one manufacturer or a certain class of manufacturers were responsible for this sweating system, it could even be applied to a certain class of manufacturers with the names of the manufacturers mentioned.

4278. Supposing you made your Act operative only with regard to the East End of London, do you not suppose that the sweaters would immediately remove just outside the limits of the East End of London?

No; and I will say why. If such an Act were made, I think it would become at once a stigma against any trade that had it applied to it, and it would make other trades and other centres very much more careful of the conditions under which their work was done in order to avoid the necessity of the stigma.

4279. Do you think that that stigma would attach equally to foreigners living abroad, their own country?

I do not quite understand that remark.

4280. My point is this: as you say that a stigma would attach to those who practised the sweating system; here, I ask do you not think that foreigners would immediately begin to do work under the sweating system abroad and would not mind whether the English people considered that a stigma attached to it or not?

I think that might occur, but I think that then England might have a much better chance of success in doing its best to represent to whatever country practised it the unfairness of the system and try and induce them to follow its example, which it could not do at the present time whilst it allows the system to go on in this country.

4281. In fact, whatever the consequences might be to England, that England should set an example to the rest of the world?

I think so.

4282. Then one of your objects in registration was that the Factory Acts should be extended to these workrooms; may I ask which provisions of the Factory Acts you deem especially valuable?

The sanitary arrangements are especially beneficial in the Factory Acts.

4283. Do you mean the sanitary inspection by the Inspector of the Local Authority or by the Factory Inspector?

By the Factory Inspector I mean; the space that is allowed for each individual. I am also bound to say, as regards that, that the Factory Acts, as at present constituted, I think, are insufficient for the purpose, and might be made a little more strict; and, I think, also that there are very few people who know quite what is the space that should be allowed for people in rooms. I think that they do not understand gauging the dimensions of air and so on that are necessary for workers.

4284. That they do not understand cubic measurement?

No.

4285. With regard to the Factory Acts, you said, as I understood you, that you

you thought that they needed amendment; in what way, in what respect, do you think they need amendment?

I really meant the enforcement of them.

4286. The application of the Acts?

Yes.

4287. Not the Acts themselves?

No.

4288. Will you explain another point a little more; I do not understand what you mean by throwing responsibility on guilds; do you mean to say that the Merchant Taylers, for instance, should be held responsible for all the evils of the sweating system in the clothing trade?

No, not quite that; I meant that they might be referred to and asked to co-operate; not to be charged with the responsibility, but really to take upon themselves the responsibility of endeavouring to get any evil system abolished.

4289. Do you mean that Parliament should confer powers upon them; do you mean that they should be entrusted with statutory powers to do what you wish?

No, I did not mean that at all; I meant really that they should be asked to consider it a part of their duty.

4290. In fact, in your opinion, you would look to them as the head of the trade for seeing that the trade was conducted on proper lines?

Yes.

4291. Now, in your own particular business, do you make any contracts with the people who work for you, to work for you for a certain time?

No.

4292. Do you know whether that is the practice in the trade generally?

I know that it has been practised under circumstances; I should hardly think that it would be right to say that it is done generally.

4293. But do you know of cases in which men are bound to work for a certain firm for a twelvemonth say, and that during that time so much of their weekly money is kept back to be forfeited in case they break the contract?

I have seen that stated more than once in a newspaper; I have seen the firm's name mentioned and that they have been asked to refute it and they have not refuted it.

4294. Do you know whether there have ever been any cases in which journeymen have ever brought actions to recover that money from firms who had retained it?

I saw the report of an action; I am not quite certain as to whether it was for this money that was detained or whether it was on some other ground that the question of this detained money came before the court.

4295. Do you think that such a contract is a fair contract to ask a man to enter into a contract, whereby he binds himself to work for the firm, but the firm retain to themselves the absolute liberty of dismissing him at any moment?

I think it is quite fair if the man perfectly understands what he is doing, and if he is an adult; I do not see that it can be otherwise than fair under those conditions to make a contract of that sort.

4296. Is it the case that where this custom obtains, he is aware of the nature of the contract, or is advantage taken of his being a foreigner and unable to read English?

From my knowledge of the men who accept these contracts, I should think they are fully capable of taking care of their own interests; they are the sweating masters who would enter into such a contract.

4297. There have been instances in many trades in which the men have successfully combined to raise the price of their labour; do you see any

any reason why that should be more difficult in the boot trade than in other trades?

I do not think it is more difficult in the boot trade otherwise than in the sweating portion of it.

4298. Among the journeymen I mean, not among sweating masters?

Yes, I should think it would be more difficult amongst the journeymen.

4299. Will you say why?

For the reason that I stated, that the journeymen are very closely watched by their masters.

4300. Earl of *Derby*.] I am not sure that I quite understand what you propose as to registration. If a man takes home-work to do it in his own home, is he bound to register his house as a workshop?

I should think he must register his house if he works in any and every room of it; but I should think he would be quite at liberty to register one room of it if he only worked in that one room.

4301. Then you would compel him to register even though he employed no one except himself; is that so?

No, I think not if he simply worked alone.

4302. You would not enforce registration in that case?

I think perhaps there would be no necessity.

4303. If the man and the wife both worked, would you enforce registration in that case?

Yes.

4304. On what ground do you make that distinction?

The reason I think is this; that women and children should be protected by the Factory Acts and that a wife or child should enjoy the same protection I think as anybody else, if they are made responsible persons by working at a trade.

4305. You would enforce registration where the wife and children are employed, as a measure of protection for them?

Yes.

4306. But if the man does not employ his wife or his children to work for him or with him, but brings another man into the house, would you compel registration in that case?

Yes.

4307. Although there is no question there of protecting women or children?

No. I should state that it becomes then a workshop.

4308. You also spoke of restricting the hours of adult labour; do you extend that to all trades or only to one particular trade?

I spoke of that simply in connection with this proposed Sweating Act, and of course it would simply be applied to the special trade on which the Sweating Act was enforced.

4309. Have you fixed in your own mind on the length of hours?

Not more than 12 was my limit, inclusive of at least 1½ hours for meals.

4310. Do you propose to enforce that restriction upon men working in their own homes?

Single men working alone in their own homes?

4311. Yes?

It would have to be enforced upon the trade, even upon men working in their own homes, in that special trade to which it was applied.

4312. Then on what ground do you put that restriction of the hours of labour; is it on the ground of making more work for others, or is it on the ground of health and necessity of sufficient repose?

On the ground that there is an evil recognised. I am assuming that there is

an evil recognised in a specific trade, the same as there is at present an evil recognised in certain trades about which the inquiry is being made; and if the conclusion should be arrived at that this evil does exist in the special trade the Act would be applied to that trade in that special part of the town or country as it might be.

4313. You would ascertain first whether there was too much industry in any trade, so that it required repressing?

Hardly "too much industry," but as to whether the conditions under which the industry was carried on were pernicious.

4314. I do not understand how you propose to enforce a law of that kind, supposing it passed; you may regulate labour in workshops or in factories, but if a man takes work to do it at home, who is there to know, who is there to watch, how many hours he works?

The home that he worked in, I assume, would be under the Factory Acts.

4315. You said just now that if he worked alone you would not enforce registration?

I would not.

4316. But even if the place were registered, who is to take account of the precise number of hours he works, and when he leaves off?

The factory inspectors are the only people who could be responsible for that, I imagine. As to who the factory inspectors might be becomes a question, and it is quite possible that it would be a benefit if the factory inspectors could be made somewhat on the same basis as special constables under such conditions. If a Sweating Act had to be applied, probably special factory inspectors might be engaged.

4317. I do not think you quite understand the difficulty that I feel in the matter. The inspector, whoever he may be, cannot be in every man's home at all hours of the day; who is there to know at what hour the man starts work in the morning and at what hour he leaves off at night?

I do not think that there would be anybody. I do not see any possible system that you can have of registration where a dial would show the number of hours that a man worked; but if there were a heavy penalty attached to the infringement of the Act, that might act beneficially in forcing a man to act according to law.

4318. I will put it to your own good sense; do you not see that such an Act would be absolutely nugatory as applied to a man working in his own house, from the impossibility of enforcing it?

I think it would be difficult to enforce it upon him; but if that were found to be the only difficulty, the Act might be framed so that work should not even be given out of factories under the circumstances.

4319. Should not be given out except to factories, you mean?

Except in factories, under the circumstances.

4320. Then you see you are driven to impose a fresh restriction; you would object to any work being done except, as it were, under the public eye in a registered workshop, with a certain number of people at work?

Yes; but I am not quite sure that the Act would be of no use at all in regard to those men that I speak of, because I do not think that all men are so devoid of honesty as to break through a law; there might be some, but I do not think that all would; I think that men, as a rule, are satisfied to obey a law.

4321. Do you think that a man would consider it dishonest to work an hour longer than the law allowed, for the purpose of completing a job?

I do, under the circumstances of a special Act; because I take it that if (as I have thought it out) a trade were under this special Act, and it could show in the course of time that it had cleared itself from the odium of the sweating system, probably might have the Sweating Act removed from it.

4322. But that would require a special Act of Parliament in each case, first to impose the restriction and then to take it off?

I was not aware of that.

4323. If

4323. If I understand you, you admit that the law which you suggest could be violated by anyone who chose to violate it, but you think it would have a moral effect?
I think it would have a moral effect, and I think also that the factory inspectors would have some control over it.

4324. Lord *Clinton.*] You give out some of your work I understand, the machine closing, and lasting, and finishing?
Yes.

4325. How is that done; machine closing to one set of persons, lasting and finishing to another?
Lasting to another and finishing to another.

4326. Do you know where that work is done?
Yes.

4327. Is it done in private houses?
Mostly; some in workshops.

4328. But now, do you know that that work is not sub-let?
Yes.

4329. You know it is not sub-let?
Yes; I am not speaking of the machine closing.

4230. I spoke of machine closing first?
Machine closing is done on this principle of sub-letting.

4331. A middleman?
Yes; as a rule it is done by a woman.

4332. That comes under your definition of sweating?
No, I beg your pardon. The sweating, of course, I admit it comes under, but not under the sweating system.

4333. Then who gives out the work in your factory?
A special man.

4334. You have a foreman to give it out?
Yes.

4335. But you say you know in every case where the work is done?
I know that the work is done in the people's homes, or in a particular workroom, because we have to send to the places for securities, and we have to send to the places where they work. I, individually, have not been to all these places, personally.

4336. But you take care to inquire?
Yes.

4337. And as far as you know, that work, the lasting and finishing, is not sub-let?
Yes, I am very careful to inquire about that matter. I should like to state, in answer to those questions, that it is easy for any manufacturer to do the same thing; it is not at all a difficult matter to find out where a man's work is made, and under what conditions it is being made.

4338. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] You say with regard to the respectable middlemen you employ, that you know that the men they employ are not employed for long hours, and under unsanitary conditions?
Yes.

4339. Will those men always be able to stand against competition; will other men not come and offer to do it at a smaller rate?
The class of work that is made by the sweated labour that I of, hardly competes in itself with other work; the only way in which it can compete is that it produces an inferior article altogether which gets into the market.

4340. And people will buy it?
And people will buy it. I think there is a very large amount of the population

tion of England that is almost bound to buy the minimum price article in many things; and in that manner I think it competes, in fact I am sure it competes, against the other work.

4341. But do you not have middlemen of the class that you wish to employ, underselling each other, competing with each other, as well as an inferior class competing with a superior class; in the class of respectable middlemen whom you employ is their not competition going on?

The men that I employ are not called middlemen. I really cannot say that these men all work absolutely without any assistants; they are not called middlemen, they are called individual workmen; but it is known that they do employ a lad occassionally to help them with the smaller portions of their work.

4342. And do they not compete with one another for smaller and smaller wages?

No, not at all; there are fixed prices stated for our work, and each man had the same price for everything; numbers are given to the boots and it would be impossible to give one man one price and another man another. I would like also now to be allowed to make a statement as regards the payment of wages in the boot and shoe trade. It has been before this Committee, I believe, that the Jewish Manufacturers do not employ workmen at trade price; and I would like to say that out of about 400 manufacturers in London, there are under 30 who do pay to what are called statement prices, but that there are a great many manufacturers who pay trade wages. I am a manufacturer who does not pay to the statement, because the work that is made in first and second class statement shops is of a very high class. I would like, if possible, to remove any impression that Jewish Manufacturers do not pay fair wages. That was a point that I thought it due to explain.

4343. Did I understand you that the action of the Act that you wished for would really be somewhat penal?

No, I have never viewed it as that; merely that the fine should be heavy.

4344. But you would only have it in places where you thought it was demanded by the state of work there?

Yes.

4345. And you would take it off when it improved?

Yes, if they could show that it was improved, satisfactorily to the Government.

4346. A limited number of people?

To satisfy the Guild, or the Commission, or the Committee that was appointed to look into the matter.

4347. Suppose that the working hours were fixed at 12 hours a day, how would you prevent the workmen going off after their 12 hours at one shop to work at another?

The only way that I see that that could be prevented would be by fixing the time, say, from eight till eight in the day.

4348. You would, therefore, limit the hours during which the work would be carried on as well as the total number of hours. When you said that the families needed protection, did you state that from your own experience; are they cruelly used in your experience?

No, I should not be inclined to say that at all.

4349. Then why should they need protection in that case?

I think that where women and children are made responsible by working at the husband's trade, they should enjoy the same advantages of protection by factory rules as any others. I cannot see why a man should be allowed to work his wife and child any longer than anybody else's wife and child.

4350. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Have manufacturers in general any means of knowing under what terms the people under the middlemen they employ are working.

working. You say that you give out most of your own work to individuals who do the work at home. Supposing there are one or two in a hundred who do not, would you have any means of knowing what terms these one or two individuals are working under?

Yes, I have never found any difficulty in finding out that; one comes much into contact with these people if there is any desire to do so; and in asking them questions it is not difficult to find out.

4351. Lord *Monkswell.*] You say that you think public opinion in England would not allow interference with foreign immigration; do you propose to leave foreign immigration alone only because you think public opinion would not admit of interference with it, or do you yourself think that on the whole it would not be advisable to interfere with it?

I think that is on both accounts.

4352. You agree with public opinion, in fact?

Yes.

4353. *Chairman.*] You spoke about the necessity a large number of people were under of buying a cheap kind of goods; I suppose that that really is one of the main causes of the existence of the sweating system?

No; I should say not. I think that the reason of this sweating system is the desire to compete favourably with foreign goods; I do not think that it is caused by a call for a common class of goods from the people. I think that people who have been perfectly satisfied for years to buy things, say at 5 *s.*, do not ask for the same sort of things at 4 *s.*, but they buy them when they are put before them. I think that the sweating system puts before the public the cheap articles, and that it is not the public that particularly calls for them; I feel quite sure that that is the case.

4354. I understood you rather to speak in the opposite direction just now, and to say that there is a large demand for cheap goods?

I think I said that there is a very large portion of the public who will always avail themselves of the minimum priced article.

4355. Could the sweating system be applied equally well to more expensive and better finished articles?

Not equally well, certainly.

4356. It is more applicable to the most unskilled forms of labour?

Yes.

4357. I suppose there is great competition among the sweating masters to get orders, is there not?

Yes, that is growing more and more.

4358. To your knowledge, is there anything in the shape of bribery that goes on; do they bribe the foreman, or the man who puts out the work?

Not to my personal knowledge; that is all hearsay also.

4359. I suppose you cannot speak, of your personal knowledge, as to the way in which the sweating masters treat their men, and so on; whether they treat them kindly?

I have seen them in their work rooms, and, as I have said, the men seem to fear them; I have spoken to some of the journeymen sweaters, who state that they are very harshly used, and bound to work up to very late, even during the night, if necessary.

4360. But that may be on account of the requirements of the trade. I spoke rather of the way in which the sweating masters act towards them, whether they personally treat them kindly or use them harshly?

Of course I should consider that a man was being used harshly if he was bound to work all night.

4361. With regard to your idea of a special Act of Parliament to apply in special cases, have you in your mind any idea of the machinery by which it is to

to be put into operation, and who should be responsible for applying it or withdrawing it?

I have not; I did not go so far as to think of that.

4362. Your idea is that there should be some Act which under certain circumstances might be applied, and which, unless the circumstances required it, ought not to be applied?

Yes, ought not to be applied; I think that such an Act as I thought would be likely to prevent the system from growing up also in other trades..

4363. Earl of *Onslow.*] Although we have not heard of any royal remedy for the sweating system generally, do you think that if more masters who put out their work were to inquire into the conditions under which it is done and the hours that the people work, they might, considering the great competition that there is, considerably alleviate the sufferings that we have heard so much of?

That the manufacturers could alleviate the sufferings, do you mean?

4364. That by inquiring into the conditions under which the work was done they might get their work done, without paying more for it, under conditions which would be more favourable to the workers?

I think it would be very difficult for the manufacturers to have much influence over these sweating masters as to the method in which they should treat their journeymen sweaters. If they were to take it into their own hands and combine and positively say that such and such conditions should be come to, I think they would have the power to do it; if they took it into their own hands they would have the power to do it.

4365. I understand that you yourself do inquire into the conditions under which your work is done?

Yes.

4366. Do you not think that might be more generally done by the manufacturers in the trade?

I think it would be a very good thing if they did it. I mean to say this, that if the manufacturers inquired into the conditions under which these sweating masters worked, the only thing they could do would be not to give them any work out when the conditions were not such as they thought they ought to be. That is the system that I adopt. If a man's home is not clean and respectable, and if a man is working under the sweating system, or is not doing what is considered right in that way, I do not give him any work out; and if I find after he has been working for me for a little while that he developes into this state, I do not employ him. I think that is what would occur with these sweating masters.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Die Veneris, 8° *Junii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of DERBY.
Earl of ONSLOW.
Viscount GORDON (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord CLINTON.
Lord CLIFFORD OF CHUDLEIGH.
Lord FOXFORD (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord ROTHSCHILD.
Lord MONKSWELL.
Lord THRING.

LORD KENRY (EARL OF DUNRAVEN AND MOUNT-EARL), IN THE CHAIR.

MR. PETER VAN DAMME, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

4367. *Chairman.*] YOU are a cabinet maker by trade?
Cabinet and chair manufacturer.

4368. How long have you been in the trade?
I have been in the trade for this last 30 years.

4369. During that time has any change taken place in the trade?
Yes, a great deal. I have been in London for the last 10 years as a master chairmaker, and have had through my hands all classes of first-class work, and have established for myself at the present time a fair business. Till 1883–84 I had no experience of the sweating system as carried on by Mr. Maple and his employés, that is to say, the salesmen who sometimes have given me the orders to work for the firm. On several occasions I and many of my friends have been unfairly treated at Messrs. Maple and Company's, and I will give the Committee some examples.

4370. Do you mean that you have been unfairly treated as a matter of merely personal grievance, or that anything has occurred which affects the trade generally?
It affects me personally, and affects the trade generally. I must state that one of the principal men from the firm came again to me last week to give me some fresh orders.

The Committee-room is cleared. After a short time, the public are re-admitted.

4371. *Chairman.*] You have stated that you have been at one time defrauded by the firm of Messrs. Maple and Company, and you propose to give some instances; and you said, also, that the way in which you had been treated, in your estimation, affects the whole trade generally. I dare say you will explain that later on to the Committee; in the meantime, will you give the Committee the instances which you wish to put before them. You have a statement before you, I understand, which you can read to the Committee?
On the first occasion, in 1883 or 1884, I contracted verbally to deliver to Mr. Maple 12 chairs, at the price of 2 *l.* 5 *s.* per chair, from samples shown. When I delivered the 12 chairs Mr. Maple himself declared he did not know me. After complaining, I took the chairs away, when he sent a boy after me, and offered me 35 *s.* for each chair, which I refused to give him. On the second occasion, I received a verbal order from Mr. Dent, Mr. Maple's buyer,

in August 1886, for 10 chairs in Italian walnut, from a pattern chair which I had delivered at 35 *s.* I told Mr. Dent I could not repeat them at this price. His answer was that "the price was no object to him if the workmanship and material were of the finest quality, as they had obtained an order for them." In spite of this declaration, he refused to pay me more than 36 *s.* These chairs cost me 2 *l.* each. On the third occasion, the chairs above referred to were spoilt by Mr. Maple's polisher. Mr. Maple sent them to me to be cleaned and re-carved. For this I paid 4 *l.* for labour, and charged only 4 *l.* 5 *s.*, as it was a mistake by their polisher. I could never recover this amount, and only after many applications, and on the application of my accountant, I have been able to obtain 2 *l.* On the fourth occasion (the 17th of September 1886), Mr. Adams, Mr. Maple's manager, ordered me to make a design from a Louis Seize cabinet that he had in stock I made the design, which was approved by Mr. Adams. I then completed the arm-chair, and on charging 12 *l.* for this chair, the cost of which was 10 *l.* to me, they refused to have it at all, but afterwards made me an offer of 7 *l.* for this same chair. This I refused. Then the fifth occasion was on the 1st October 1886. I made a Louis Seize arm-chair, ordered by Mr. Stallebrasse, for 4 *l.* When it was delivered Mr. Stallebrasse passed my account, but when I came for my cheque on Friday night there was no cheque for me, as Mr. Maple found fault that it was too dear, and tried to deduct another sovereign. This I would not accept, and then I was eventually paid less 2½ per cent.

4372. What was the name of the gentleman you mentioned?
Stallebrasse, one of the salesmen. Since that I have not been near them; but last week one of the principals came and gave me another verbal order.

4373. Is it the custom of the trade to act entirely upon verbal orders?
It is not; but I have received many a time verbal orders which people paid me just as good as if they had been written orders; on many occasions that has happened.

4374. Do you ever have written contracts?
Yes.

4375. How is it that, having been as you allege defrauded in this way in the first case, you executed any further verbal orders?
When I received the first order for 12 chairs from Mr. Maple, I brought him a sample, and he said, "You can make me 12 chairs like this." At the same moment he was called away by some one who was, perhaps, a customer, and I could not run after him to ask him for a written order. Being a gentleman, I took his word for it.

4376. I asked you why, having been treated once in this way, you did not take care to have a written contract in future?
I have had contracts verbally which I have been paid for honestly several times. In fact, last Saturday I took another order for four chairs at 5 *l.* 5 *s.* each verbally; but I am positive it will be paid for on delivery.

4377. Have you any idea, can you tell the Committee at all, how many orders you have executed for this firm?
I do not think it is more than about 200 *l.* or 250 *l.* altogether since I have worked for them.

4378. How many orders would that mean?
It would be very difficult for me to say how many orders I have had from them.

4379. You have mentioned, I think, five cases in which you have been, as you say, defrauded?
Yes.

4380. Do you suppose you have executed 10 or 12 orders altogether for this firm?
More than that; perhaps 30 or 40.

4381. And

4381. And in five cases out of those 30 or 40 orders, you have been treated in this particular way?
Yes.

4382. And not in any other cases?
No.

4383. And have you any idea why you were treated in this particular way in those five cases?
My idea is that it is the sweating system; that he tried to take all the profit he could possibly get out of me, knowing that I could not cut my chairs in pieces, or pay them away when I had 20 men, perhaps, to pay on Saturday.

4384. Assuming that to be the object, how do you account for the fact that it was only tried on upon you in five cases out 30 or 40?
I did not ask particularly for a written order; I really do not know why I did not do so; he might have said, "Have you no confidence in me?"

4385. What I asked you was, assuming that you are correct in saying that you were treated in this particular way in order that Messrs. Maple might get every advantage they can out of you, how do you account for the fact that they only treated you in this way in five cases out of 30 or 40 cases in which you executed orders for them; why are you not always treated in this way?
That I cannot tell. They could not find any fault with my work, because I only make first-class work.

4386. I want to understand, if you can explain to the Committee, how it is that you consider that this action on the part of Messrs. Maple towards you individually affects the cabinet-making trade generally; has it caused you to cut down the wages of your workmen; is that what you mean?
For instance, if Messrs. Maple give an order for 50 *l.*, and when you bring the work in you can only receive 30 *l.*, it spoils the other firms as well; because, if the cabinet is worth 60 *l.* or 100 *l.* in another shop, they can very likely afford to sell at so much less than any other firm.

4387. You mean that Messrs. Maple can undersell the other firms if by defrauding you they are enabled to sell the goods cheaper than other firms can; is that what you mean?
Yes.

4388. Lord *Monkswell.*] Do I understand you to say that Messrs. Maple refuse to give you written contracts?
I did not ask for them when I received a verbal order.

4389. You have never asked?
I have never asked.

4390. You have never got a written order, and never asked for one?
On some orders I have had written orders.

4391. From Messrs. Maple?
Yes; all the work which I have done for them has not been executed verbally.

4392. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Many of the orders you have had have been small orders, have they not?
Small amounts.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. WILLIAM FRANKLIN DICKSON, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

4393. *Chairman.*] You are a cabinet maker?
Yes.

4394. You have heard the evidence given by the former witness?
Yes.

4395. Have you anything, any special point, you wish to bring out before the Committee as regards your trade?
Thirteen years ago Messrs. Maple threw upon my hands goods for which they had given me orders to the extent of 420 *l.*, the sole reason for their doing so being our refusing to take from the agreed price 2 *l.* 2 *s.* 6 *d.* from one table, and one sovereign from the agreed price of a wardrobe, being altogether 3 *l.* 2 *s.* 6 *d.*, because we refused to take that off, Mr. Regnart, the gentleman who still has the management of the department, said, "I will not take any of your orders," and he did not take it, and we have done nothing for them since; and we had to dispose of that 420 *l.* worth of orders at a great deal of disadvantage, and in the best manner we could.

4396. Is that the only order you ever received?
No; we had had lots of orders previous to that.

4397. And Mr. Regnart, I understand you to say, made a reduction beyond the price agreed upon?
Yes.

4398. Was it a verbal contract or written one?
Verbal in that case. When the goods were ordered for stock it was a usual thing only to say verbally, "I will take such and such things; give me those;" but when the things were made for orders, and the salesmen themselves gave the order, they would usually give you a written order; but in Mr. Regnart's case, he always, I think, was buying for stock and did not give written orders.

4399. I understand that in buying for stock it is not customary to have written contracts, but in buying for special orders it is?
Yes; it is so, the reason being that a different gentleman orders; the salesman himself, who takes the order from the customer would usually give out his own order, and he would mostly, not always, but mostly, give you a written order. There are plenty of firms who profess to have nothing without a written order, and have that printed, but in half the cases they do not give you that order, and if you say, "Shall I have an order?" they say, "Oh, no; it does not matter."

4400. Was the deduction asked for in the shape of discount?
No.

4401. On what ground?
The ground in one case was this: a table was ordered by Mr. Regnart, the agreed price being 14 *l.* 2 *s.* 6 *d.* When it went home, he said, "That is too much; I am not going to pay you that." I went to see Mr. Regnart, and said, "Have you any complaint to make about the table?" "No," he said, "but I can buy it for 12 *l.*" I said, "You have a right to buy where you like, but the agreed price was 14 *l.* 2 *s.* 6 *d.*, and in my opinion it is well worth the money, and we cannot make any abatement." I saw him a few times with regard to this, and another job, and it ultimately ended in his saying, "If you do not allow this, I will throw all your orders on your hands," and he did so.

4402. Earl of *Onslow.*] Was it not formerly the practice in the trade not to pay for goods delivered until some months after their delivery?
We never have our money on delivery.

4403. How

4403. How long after delivery?
A monthly account.

4404. Do they charge any discount?
We allow 2½ per cent. discount.

4405. Was that 2½ per cent. discount any part of this sum which you say was withheld from you?
No.

4406. Earl of *Derby*.] When these verbal agreements are made is anything specified as to the quality of the article to be supplied?
No, they would know your class of goods. It was never a question of the quality. Have the goods been unsatisfactory they have always been put right.

4407. But does not that leave a considerable opening for misunderstanding?
No; because a certain man makes a certain class of goods, and it is always understood what class of goods he makes, and what class of goods are expected by them from him.

4408. We have not got from you on what ground this deduction from the stipulated amount was made?
There was no ground at all, except that they thought they would like to have it off.

4409. Then do you mean to say that in the first instance the price was decided upon?
Yes, that is so.

4410. And that when it came to payment you were paid less than the price?
We were not paid less, because we refused to allow it.

4411. You were offered less?
We were offered less, and had these orders thrown on our hands because we would not take less.

4412. What ground was alleged for offering you less?
None.

4413. *Chairman*.] You said that the ground was that he alleged he could get them cheaper?
Yes.

4414. Earl of *Derby*.] Was there in the first instance an absolute contract as to the price?
An absolute contract.

4415. Lord *Clinton*.] What is the date of this?
The 23rd September 1874. That is a long time ago, but it is still the same gentleman who is the manager of that department.

4416. And that was the only occasion on which you had any dealings with him?
Yes.

4417. Lord *Rothschild*.] Was it the first time you ever dealt with Messrs. Maple?
No.

4418. Was it the only time they ever tried to reduce the price of the article?
Yes, it was the only time; we had only worked for them for a few months.

4419. The only reason they alleged was that they could get similar articles cheaper elsewhere?
Yes;

Yes; but having a definite price, we did not see that that was any reason for our not getting the agreed price.

4420. *Chairman.*] A former witness mentioned a case of having goods spoiled by the polisher, and having to make that good, as I understood; is that the custom in the cabinet trade?

If the goods were wrong in any respect they would be returned, and rightly so.

4421. I mean if they are damaged in any way after you have sent them into the firm, and they are returned on that account, is it the custom of the trade that the manufacturer has to make them good without any additional price?

If the fault was his, he would have to do so.

4422. But if the fault occurred, not with him, but with the firm?

Then that certainly is not the custom of the trade.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. THOMAS CLARKE, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined as follows:

4423. What is your occupation?

I am a partner in Messrs. Gillows.

4424. It has been suggested in evidence before the Committee that goods should be marked in the name of the makers; have you anything to say to the Committee on that point?

Nothing further than this, that I do not think that goods should be marked as manufactured by a well-known house unless they are actually made by them.

4425. You mean manufactured on their own premises?

Yes; we never mark anything that we do not manufacture.

4426. But do you not buy from outside also?

To a very limited extent.

4427. In those cases do you put your mark on them?

None whatever. We occasionally buy some fine examples of French furniture, and most of these examples we are now repeating ourselves in this country, examples beautifully made. We never put our name on goods unless we manufacture them ourselves.

4428. Then do you suggest that the goods should be marked with the name of the firm, only when they are made upon the premises; or do you suggest that all goods sold should be marked with the name of the actual manufacturer?

No, I do not actually suggest that; but I think if a customer came to Gillows for furniture, he would naturally expect to get furniture manufactured by Gillows or by a house of equal reputation to Gillows. Therefore, I think it would be extremely wrong if furniture of an indifferent quality were sold under the impression that it was manufactured by some one with a high reputation. I think a house ought not to put their name upon a thing unless they manufacture it themselves.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

8th June 1888.

Mr. HENRY WALTHAM, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

4429. *Chairman.*] ARE you a cabinet maker?

I am a working upholsterer, and Secretary of the London Upholsterers' Trade Society. I have held that office for 12 years.

4430. Is that a masters' society?

No; it is a journeymen's society, for all West End, high-class, skilled workmen. I have been secretary also of the Upholsterers' Club from the date of its formation up to last February. That is a club of nearly every grade of upholsterers that you can find in the United Kingdom; it is a sort of social intercourse where we meet together and exchange our mutual views on what is really going on. In my official capacity the sweating system has been continually before me. During the past 15 years the effect of the sweating, as practised in the large drapery houses in Tottenham Court-road and elsewhere, has been felt most acutely by the high class West End firms, much to the detriment of the workmen. The main cause of complaint among the skilled upholsterers is that these houses, by the introduction of the piecemaster or sweater, the employment of boy labour, the subdivision of the trade, and the use of very inferior material for the interior part of their work, have brought the trade to such a low level that a boy, after serving his time, finds that, when he expects to gain a livelihood as a journeyman, there is no work for him to do, unless he sinks all his manhood and works for boy's wages. It is a common occurrence for a man to stand idle for three or four months in the year, while the boys in these sweaters' shops are set to race one another as to who shall produce the work quickest, irrespective of quality. This system is grossly unfair to the parents of these boys, who naturally think, having put their boys to learn their trade in a large firm, that they will be taught properly. Such, however, is not the case; for it is notorious that these lads, after serving one apprenticeship in these firms, have to pick up their trade in the best way they can afterwards. The effect of this system on the West End trade has been to diminish the number of men and apprentices engaged in legitimate West End firms during the past 15 years some 30 per cent. The experience of our body is very depressing, for we find that as the system affected the number of men and apprentices employed by the high-class firms, so it acted on the society by destroying the source from which we obtained our members, who are all skilled upholsterers; the statistical result being a decrease of membership some 30 per cent. in the course of the past 12 years This result is clearly traceable to the trade having been attracted to the large drapery firms in Tottenham Court-road, who carry on business almost entirely by sweaters and boy labour. In all our endeavours to trace the origin of this curse to the workman, we invariably arrive at the firm of Maple and Co. This firm has always borne the reputation of a sweating house, and, as a fact, no upholsterer ever thinks of applying for work there unless he has exhausted every other channel, and even then only when every other resource has failed. I know men who have tried to work there, but after two or three days have left in disgust at the tyrannical crushing system and the vile language used to them by the foreman and officials generally. The system adopted shows in some cases an apparently fair bargain between capital and labour; but a very short experience shows the one-sidedness of the arrangement by the fact that it is no matter what rate of wage a man may be paid, the value of the work produced by him, taken at the firm's own valuation, is invariably more than he receives. That the firm know this evil exists is shown by this fact: In reply to Mr. Blundell Maple's challenge and denial of the charge of sweating made in his speech at Dulwich on 23rd November 1887——

4431. You are speaking of your own knowledge in the statements you have made?

 Yes,

Yes, entirely of my own knowledge. I have ample means of verifying every word I state.

4432. Lord *Thring*.] Is it from hearing what other workmen tell you that you make these statements or from individual experience?

Not from individual experience, but from facts that have been brought before me in my official capacity by workmen.

4433. Will they be here to give evidence themselves?

Some of them are coming. I am going to give the effect which we trace to this one firm on the West End trade, and my statements will be supported by the witnesses who will come before you.

4434. *Chairman*.] You speak as the secretary of the society?

Yes.

4435. And what you state will be supported by evidence?

Yes. Mr. Blundell Maple, in his speech at Dulwich, made a challenge and denial of the charge of sweating. Now, our society challenged the truth of his statements so far as the upholsterers were concerned, and offered to prove to him that they were sweated in his firm. We did not wish to enter into any conflict with the capitalists in any shape or form; we simply challenged the truth of the statements he made. He wrote one letter back asking for a copy of the speech referred to to be sent him, and, after a copy of the speech had been sent to him, he never had the courtesy even to acknowledge the receipt of two other letters, even though specially asked to do so. In short, it is the experience of our society that all the sweating from which our trade suffers is traceable to Messrs. Maple and Co., and they recognise the fact that the existence of such firms is demoralising to the workmen, unfair to the customer, and dangerous to the State.

4436. How long have you been secretary of the association to which you have referred?

Twelve years.

4437. Has the state of things you describe existed during the whole of that period?

During the whole of my lifetime they have been before me individually. I served my apprenticeship at Jackson and Graham's, one of the best firms in the metropolis; and ever since I can recollect I have always heard Maple's being spoken of as a sweating firm, and I know from actual experience of the work that I have seen that there is no comparison between what is turned out of a high-class West End firm and their work. I have had many customers point out to me in their houses that they could buy a chair like that at Maple's for so much less; but it is absolutely different; the material is not to be compared with what is used in the high-class West End firm.

4438. You say that in your experience Maple's is a sweating firm; what do you mean by that?

I mean that they not only do not pay the legitimate trade wage to the workman, but they use him worse, and endeavour, when he is working for them, to reduce that wage by some side means; for instance, one man made a statement to me that he was employed at 45 *s*. a week.

4439. Is that man here?

I do not know whether he is here; but he is producible.

4440. We cannot receive a statement made to you by somebody else?

Only it came to me in an official capacity. The question was asked me, "Is this sweating?"

4441. What I asked you was, what you mean when you say that a particular firm is a sweating firm?

I take it that a firm is a sweating firm that pretends to pay a man what they do not.

4442. What

4442. What do you mean by that?
If a firm pretends to pay a man 10½ *d.* an hour for his work, and only pays him 10½ *d.* per hour, and will not pay him for odd quarter and half-hours, and expects him to produce a certain amount of work in the course of an hour, which at their own valuation is far more than the man's wage; if a man receives 45 *s.* for a week's work, and he has to produce work which is valued at 57 *s.* or 58 *s.* for it, he is sweated.

4443. But is that peculiar to Maple and Company?
That is peculiar to that firm.

4444. Lord *Thring.*] Have you ever been employed by Maple?
No, I am happy to say.

4445. Then what you are going to say is not of your own knowledge?
It is so much of our own knowledge that it is impossible for anything to be done in the trade but what we know of it.

4446. That is not the question; you have heard what you are going to state to us from somebody else?
Yes.

4447. *Chairman.*] Have you anything further you wish to say of your own knowledge?

That is all I can tell you from my own actual knowledge, if you refuse to accept what I am told by the members of my body.

4448. Earl of *Derby.*] Can you bring men here who can speak from their own knowledge to the facts you have mentioned.
You will have some men before you this afternoon, I believe, who will do so.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

THOMAS BROIDER, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

4449. *Chairman.*] ARE you an upholsterer?
I am, and have worked at Maple's.

4450. Where do you work?
I have worked at Maple's; I am now employed by Howard and Son, of Berners-street.

4451. In what capacity were you employed by Maple?
As a journeyman upholsterer. If you will allow me, perhaps I may just as well read this statement over.

4452. You are speaking of your own experience?
My own experience. This, I think, will meet the slight defect in the last witness's evidence. About seven years ago I worked for about four months for Maple and Company as an upholsterer. It was piece-work.

4453. That is on their own premises?
On their own premises. And I often complained of the prices being reduced without notice. A fixed price was paid me for several weeks for upholstering a dining-room suite in leather, and then, when I had finished another exactly similar, they would not pay me so much for it without notice of a reduction.

4454. How do you mean "without notice of reduction"?
As a piece-worker. A piece-worker has a right, I do not know that there is any particular law for it, but it is the unwritten law, that a man working in a piece-shop has his prices set for his job before he starts with it.

4455. Will you explain to the Committee how the prices are fixed?
In the other shops that I have worked in, supposing I got an easy chair to do, I would not be told the price by the foreman, but there would be an understood price in the shop amongst the men who had done the same class of chair before, and I would get exactly the price that had been paid to the other men. There is no occasion, as it were, to ask the foreman the price of the job, because the other men would tell me the price of the job as there had been a number done before.

4456. Was not that the custom also in Messrs. Maple's?
No; it was not when I was there.

4457. Perhaps you will explain, before you go on, how you had the price fixed there?
The price was fixed by a precedent in my own experience.

4458. You mean that you would say to yourself, "I got so much before, and therefore I shall get the same now"?
Yes. When I had finished another exactly similar, they would not pay me so much for it. Of course, that took place repeatedly. Being hard up, I could not afford to turn up the job, so I was forced to give in, even with these reductions continually going on. At last I stood out against it, and having complained to the foreman of a reduction of 5 *s.* in a suite, but without effect, I saw Mr. Regnart, he being, as I took it, the head of the department. I told the foreman before I went there that I should go to the head of the firm, and would accept nothing but justice, because he admitted that my work was good, and could find no fault with it. I saw Mr. Regnart, and explained the matter to him. He sent for the foreman, and when he (the foreman) returned, I was discharged. I could not obtain the 5 *s.*, and therefore summoned Maple and Co. in the county court for it, when it was paid into court. The other men in the shop repeatedly complained of similar deductions, but they were not so independent as I was, and had to put up with them. Being married men and men in different circumstances, they had to accept it, or else they would go on the streets for the winter; this was in November. The men are really oppressed and never know what money they will receive at the end of the week. I cannot speak as to what it is now, but of the time when I was employed there. What prompted me to come here at all was Mr. Maple's speech at Dulwich, and his saying that his firm paid the highest rate of wages in the country, and then he thanked God that his firm was above suspicion, and all that sort of thing. Of course you may imagine what men like myself, who have experienced such treatment, feel about it. I could not rest without coming to explain to your Lordships how they have treated me.

4459. You said that the deductions were very frequently made; after the first deduction was made in that way, why did you not, before taking a job in future, ask what you were to be paid for it?
It is a matter of history, so far as the shop is concerned, the continual bothers I had there week after week, actually fighting for what I had worked for. They try all manner of schemes to keep on reducing the actual upholsterer; and when I went in there they had a day workshop and a piece workshop, and they thought that by getting the work done in the day workshop a little cheaper, they could make the two workshops compete against each other.

4460. In the day workshop the men were paid by the hour?
Yes. I started work for them in the day workshop; and the very first week they would not give me what I worked for. I went into the firm, I might say, in the first instance, under stress of weather. I would never have thought of looking there for a job had I not been hard up; and, as I have said, they would not pay the money that I actually earned there.

4461. Was there any money agreed upon?
There was no money agreed upon, but you were supposed to get what you were worth; but there was a fixed limit, 50 *s.* being the limit; and I wanted that, but that they did not pay me.

4462. Fifty

4462. Fifty shillings was the lowest limit, or the highest, do you mean?
The maximum. Just to give you an idea that I was not asking for anything more than I considered properly due to me, the foreman that there is now, selected two men out of the day workshop to do the best ordered leather work that came into the place, showing that I was worth the maximum as far as my ability as a workman was concerned. They cleared the place for two of us, and the very first week, though I had worked to say 2 *l.* 12 *s.* or 2 *l.* 14 *s.*, all I could get from him was about 2 *l.* 4 *s.* I would not have objected to that if the balance had gone on to the following week, but it was wiped off altogether, and a clean sheet was started. They were actually defrauding me of 4 *s.*, 5 *s.*, 6 *s.*, and 7 *s.* a week, as it went on.

4463. What reason did they give for making that deduction?
One reason was this. With several oaths the foreman told me: "What is the good of giving you a lot of money? you will only go and spend it;" a very natural thing for anybody to do, especially me; I enjoy myself in a small way, I suppose he meant. Then I told him that did not matter to him; if I did the work and he had no fault to find, I had a right to the prices paid in the shop, and he had no right to defraud me. Subsequently to that, there was a regular swear all round; the foreman especially was abusive. This was a weekly occurrence, and in fact, the workmen in the shop always looked forward to the day before the pay-day as being a scene in the shop owing to myself, amongst the number, having what you call a swearing match with the foreman or a fight for the money actually earned. It came to this, that one day I would not stand it any longer, and I thought if I went to Mr. Regnart I would have some sort of justice. I have a little book here; I have always preserved it; I used to take a duplicate of my work as it went on, the work I did and the number of the job. I told him if he would turn up his books within a few weeks ago he would see that I had the different prices I asked for now, and why was I refused them? He did not tell me before I started a job that there was to be a deduction. Mr. Regnart looked at it, and seemed to think it fair, and said, "Well, if you go back to your work, I daresay it will be made all right." I went back and took no more notice, but the foreman was called over almost directly afterwards, and the result of it was that when he came back he told me to pack up my tools and go away. I did not mind that; I thought I had gained my point, getting my 5 *s.*; but no, he would not pay me, and I went back to Regnart again, and instead of Regnart, as I thought, keeping me right, as it were, and seeing to my getting justice in the shop, he simply walked away; he would not take any more trouble about me at all. Then the foreman, in a laughing manner, in the contemptible way he had got, said, "Summon us in the county court." I said, "I do not trouble myself; I will have it." That is really the treatment I have received there, but it is customary throughout the whole place; every week there is the usual fight for wages.

4464. Earl of *Onslow.*] I understand you that the practice in this workshop is not to agree with you beforehand for the work that you are going to do, but there is a sort of acknowledged price, and you take your chance of whether you will get it or not when the time comes?
It is so, certainly; of course, with a new hand, it is bound to be so.

4465. But have you never made any attempt to get a price fixed before you began your work?
I have. I remember once before I started another job I thought I would have my price stipulated before I went on with it; but he said he had not got any time to talk with me, and with the usual oath I was invited to go back to my work again.

4466. And when you worked on time-work, the same thing happened; you did your work, and at the end of the time you took your chance of what you could get paid for it?
No, not exactly. They judged the man by the first week's work he did; the first week he worked there: and no matter how familiar he became; if a man

became a little more familiar with the shop and the workings of the shop, so that he could turn out his work much quicker.

4467. And then he got paid more?
If he could get it. I never knew anybody in my time getting his money up.

4468. Why is it you have always worked under these somewhat disadvantageous circumstances, and do not appear to have combined to compel Messrs. Maple to make bargains with you before the work is completed?
I am of opinion that the workers are too lukewarm altogether; they will not bind themselves together; they will not join a society, and become unanimous, as it were; they might then be able to accomplish it; they will not do so.

4469. If they did do so, would not the remedy be in their own hands?
No, I do not believe it would, because I believe capital is so much stronger than labour now. At one time of day the trades unions could do some good, but now they can do no good at all.

4470. When you say that capital is stronger than labour, you mean that the competition of labour is too great.
The competition for life.

4471. For work?
For living of course. The competition is certainly very great; and on the other hand a strike is almost ridiculous, owing to the number of non-society men that are about.

4472. Then is it greater now than it was two years ago?
It is bound to be, because I can see nothing but progress that way all through; the worker is going closer and closer to the wall I might say.

4473. Is that due to the diminution of work to be done, or is it due to an increase amongst those who are seeking for work?
I cannot exactly attribute it to either of the two; but what I can say is this, that a worker receives only exactly what you might say would keep him going for a week; he has not the slightest chance of saving any money to pass him over any hard times that may come.

4474. I want you to confine yourself to the point of not making your bargain with Messrs. Maple beforehand; I want to know why you cannot combine to make your bargain beforehand?
I will tell you why we cannot combine. Every season in our trade, about March and April and May, there are such a number of men coming up from the country, the same as I did myself at one time, and you might say they completely flood the market in our line. They have not been so great of late years, owing, I dare say, to the terror of the name of Maple having got about, that if they could not get into any other shop, they could go to the "workhouse," which is the *nom de plume* of course of Maple's in the trade.

4475. Earl of *Derby*.] In short you were told that if you objected to the terms offered somebody else would take them?
Yes.

4476. You do not allege, as I understand, that there has been any actual breach of contract, but this, that you, and other persons like you, took employment without having a price stipulated in advance, but relying on what you supposed to be the general custom?
No; legally I suppose I could not claim a fixed price for any work I have done; but then having had so many precedents, I could only go by them; and as the lower price, the reduction of price, was not told me of before I started the job, I naturally expected to have the same price as I had been paid before.

4477. I can understand that happening once; but if on one occasion you had been disappointed of the price which you had reasonable grounds to expect you would receive, what induced you not to make a definite bargain in future?
I suppose certain monetary circumstances, no doubt. I would not really have

have stayed there at all after the first fortnight, but workers cannot afford to turn up a job every day, at that time of the year, it was November, when it is very difficult to get in.

4478. Then it really comes to this: that you say the employer had it in his power to fix his own price, because you were compelled by the pressure of competition to take any price that was offered; that is what it comes to?
Quite so.

4479. Then does it not come simply to this: that there is too much competition in the trade for the employment that is going; that there are too many people in search of work for the work that has to be done?
Yes, unfortunately on the face of it it seems so; though at the same time I do not think personally that there are too many people to do the upholstery work of this country that is required.

4480. But there are too many in that particular branch of the trade, and at one particular time?
Yes, at one particular time. Of course, there have been men working alongside of me that would accept a price that I refused.

4481. I suppose in all trades employers will endeavour to bring wages down, and the employed will endeavour to keep them up: is not that so?
Of course, what little fight they can make in the struggle; it is merely the semblance of a fight; but when the foreman makes use of an expression such as this: "The tendency of wages is down, down, down, and down they must come." In the bringing of the wages of the workpeople down his own go up. It seems to me that there is a premium on the grinding that the foreman can use on the employés, so that his own nest may be all the better feathered. In a place like that, I do not know exactly, but I think I could prove that his wages may have gone up 50 per cent.

4482. With whomsoever the profits may rest, your statement, as I understand it, is this: that the employed are not in a position to make a bargain for themselves?
They are not.

4483. They are too many and too poor?
They are too poor; I will not say they are too many, because all workers, in my opinion, have a right to live, and I will never say they are too many. They may be too poor to fight their battle, but that is no reason why they should be continually sat on as they are by Messrs. Maple and the like. That is the only firm I have mentioned, because that is the only firm where men have been sat on, or tried to be cheated.

4484. *Chairman.*] Have you worked for any other firms?
Yes; not for any firm long, with the exception of the one I am working for now. I have been seven years with Messrs. Howard.

4485. In shops generally is it the custom to know beforehand the price you are going to be paid?
There are a number of shops, so many well paid shops and so many mediocre and so many very poorly paid.

4486. I want to find out from you what the general custom is. You have told us that at Messrs. Maples you did not ask for a bargain beforehand as to the price you were to be paid, but you judged, by what you had been paid before, as to the money you would receive for the next piece of work you had to do. I want to know if that is the general custom?
It is the general custom in all shops; there is no shop, to my knowledge, that has a price list up.

4487. That is to say, if you had made a bargain with Messrs. Maple for the sum

sum you would receive for doing a piece of work, you would have been departing from the general custom?

Yes, it would have been departing from the general custom.

4488. Now I want to know what you mean by saying that in proportion as the workmen's wages go down, the foremen's go up?

I cannot explain any further than that it is so.

4489. How do you mean?

I believe that if the foreman in a firm like that was not what I call a good grinder of the workers, he would either not be there, or else his wages would come down; but being a good grinder, and bringing down the production of the work, reducing the employés wages, and producing the goods so much cheaper, or with so much less workmen's time on them.

4490. Do you know how the foremen are paid?

I will not say, because I cannot fix the exact sum.

4491. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] Is it your impression that the foreman is paid by a commission on the work done?

I do not think so; not the foreman in upholsterer's shops.

4492. *Chairman.*] It comes to this, that it is your opinion that the foreman's wages are increased in proportion as he succeeds in getting his work done cheaply?

It is my opinion that he must make his department a success before he can ask for more wages, and, in making his department a success, he must reduce the labour, because the prices of materials are pretty much the same.

4493. Lord *Thring.*] I understand that the custom in your trade is to go into a shop, and when you take a piece of work you know, without being told, from the nature of the work, what the price will be?

Yes.

4494. And I understand that you, amongst yourselves, consider that to be a binding contract between the master and yourself, though it is not written?

Yes.

4495. And I understand that to be the custom universally?

It is the custom universally.

4496. I understand what you say is, that when you went into Maple's shop you considered, as you did in another shop, that when you made a certain piece of goods, you would be paid a certain price?

For instance, I got a suite of morocco furniture. I worked, I might say, at the hardest work in the firm, that is, leather work, the leather shop. The first lot that I had, a couch and two easy chairs, and six small chairs. I had a price paid me for them; I knew that that was the price that had hitherto been paid for these things, from the men in the shop.

4497. Then, you considered that to be the agreed price between you and Maple for that particular sort of work?

Quite so, until we got knowledge of a reduction.

4468. Then, I understand that you allege against Maple that he broke that moral contract, by reducing it without notice?

Yes.

4499. And that is what you allege, that although in other firms that moral contract is not broken, it is broken, and has been constantly broken in Maple's shop?

Yes, that is what has constantly happened, and that in reality a man did not know what he was going to have at the end of the week.

4500. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] Before you personally worked for Maple, had you been warned by other workmen that it would be unsatisfactory?

Yes.

4501. When

4501. When did you first come to London?
In 1880.

4502. Did you commence at Messrs. Maple's?
No, I worked at Cowton's, in Oxford-street, first.

4503. You mentioned that when you left Maple's there were other men working alongside of you who took the wages which you thought too low?
Yes.

4504. You were going to explain something further; will you do so now?
I took it in this light: I had a row with them, of course, before accepting less than the recognised price for the work; I said, "Of course, if I am going to fight here week after week for the men of the shop and you will take the price which I had a row about, what is the good of my having a fight?" I asked the men to stand by me, and they would not.

4505. You did not consider that the wages were actually too low to make a proper living out of?
It depends on how you regulate the standard of living. I consider that the wages Maple's pay for the work turned out are a great deal too low, according to the prices paid in good shops for good work.

4506. £. 2 15 *s.* a week, I understood you to mention?
No; I said that I had made as much as that, and got perhaps 2 *l.* 6 *s.* for it.

4507. What was the average earned by the men, in your time, when you left?
I could not get at that.

4508. What was your own average?
A couple of pounds, I should say. But I wish you to bear in mind this, that after I left Maple, to show you the difference, I went to work for a piece-master in Worship-street, and I have taken nearly 100 per cent. more in the week.

4509. You understand that I am not advocating low wages; I simply want to know the relative conditions of work?
Suppose at this work that I can make 2 *l.* at Maple's, I could make 3 *l.* elsewhere.

4510. Do you mean that you took work at Maple's because you found it difficult to obtain work elsewhere?
I could not get a job elsewhere: I had been all round elsewhere before I went there.

4511. Lord *Sandhurst.*] You said that the workers were gradually going to the wall, first of all because of the want of combination, and further because of the influx of those who come from the country. Are those people who come from the country employed to the exclusion of the town workers?
Workmen from the country have a general knowledge of our trade, and I think they are more acceptable to foremen than men who are brought up in places like Maple's and by piece-masters that merely keep boys and teach them one branch of a trade; and they naturally get men from the country, and keep the others out.

4512. Are they better workers?
I would not like to say that.

4513. Do they work for lower wages when they first come?
Of course there is no chance of their doing that in a decent firm, because all men get paid alike; it is only in a firm like we have been talking about that they are forced to go in there and work for what this man thinks they are worth.

4514. Earl of *Onslow.*] Are they more easily taken in and ground down than the London men?

I should say so, because the London men, having their homes near at hand, can perhaps fall back upon some friends; whereas the man from the country is forced to take what will barely keep him alive.

4515. Lord *Sandhurst.*] Were there a great number of men in your trade out of employment last winter?
There were not so many last winter; I think last winter was a good winter.

4516. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Do men who come from the country consider that they are getting better wages in London than they did in the country?
No doubt of it. They come up to London with the idea of not only earning more money, but gaining greater experience.

4517. Lord *Monkswell.*] You say that on one occasion 5*s.* was paid into Court by Messrs. Maple after summons by you; did that 5*s.* stand on any different footing from the other reductions that were made week by week in your wages; how was it that you got that 5*s.*?
I could say this much, that, as far as my memory goes (I have all the jobs in this little book), it was customary then that he would not allow me to take what are called the best wages in the shop, 50*s.* a week, owing to my youth. I was like David Copperfield, and it was only that when I came to this suite I had really a pull, because I had done the same articles, or identical articles, before, and obtained a precedent for myself; I was enabled then to refer back in the book, and say, "I have had the price before; why do you not pay me now, when you have not told me before that there would be a reduction?"

4518. But was not that always so; is not that your accusation against Maple, that he was constantly doing the same thing?
Yes; but I never had a tangible case till I got that one.

4519. Lord *Rothschild.*] Is it your experience that Messrs. Maple treat their workpeople differently from other large houses.
Yes.

4520. Exceptionally?
Yes, quite.

4521. Quite exceptionally, as compared with Messrs. Howard?
Yes.

4522. Are no deductions made by them?
I cannot exactly say that either; but the deductions are hardly worth taking notice of. Of course in the different jobs as they come up, there may be a little taken off; but nothing to the deductions that have taken place at Maple's, or the scandalous treatment.

4523. *Chairman.*] Have you anything more to say?
Maple paid the money into Court rather than face the publicity; they actually paid 6*s.* into Court; that included the 1*s.* that I got back, which I had paid for the summons.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

THOMAS SHAUGHNESSY, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

4524. *Chairman.*] You are an upholsterer?
I am a journeyman upholsterer. I have been in the trade 18 years; I have worked in the country and in London. In London, I have worked at Maple's and a few of the West End houses; at present I am employed at Mr. Lehmann's, Wigmore-street.

4525. You

4525. You have 18 years' experience?
Eighteen years' experience.

4526. Has any change occurred in the trade during that time?
Yes. There are the piece-masters, there is boy-labour, and a constant reduction of prices.

4527. Will you just explain to the Committee what you have to say about those points?
The piece-master, who has come to the front, has been connected with these large firms. They are men who take a job, generally in a mews, and employ one man, and then they employ a number of boys, whom they get to do what we call the first stuffing in the trade; that is, the interior part of the chair or sofa, putting the springs in, and webbing. I worked at Messrs. Maple's over 3½ years, and it is the worst shop I have ever worked in. A man at this firm has to work twice as hard as he would have to do at a West-End house, and is bullied and blackguarded by the foreman, and is treated altogether more like a machine than a man. Every person employed in the upholstery department has to produce a certain quantity of work; that is to say, task-work (I may say that I have worked both piece-work and day-work at Maple's), in a given time; the amount of this and the prices paid being decided by the foreman, without taking the workmen into consideration at all.

4528. Is this evidence you are going to give the same as that given by the former witness; you have heard what he said on this point; it is no use repeating it. If you have anything else to say you can say it, and give us any point that is peculiar?
He was thers in 1880, and so was I for a few weeks, and then I went in 1883, and I left on the 17th of March 1887. When he was there it went from day-work to piece-work, and when I was there it went from piece-work to task work; what they call day-work. I have known several men, whose names I can give, who have worked in the workshops for six days to get paid, for the six days' labour, only three-and-a-half, four, and five days' pay, and this too, week after week. This is known in the firm as dropping time. I have also known men——

4529. How do you mean "known men"?
Men in the shop who worked next to me; we were all working in a big long shop, 18 or 20 of us, and they were on the same floor with me. I have known men who have had to rectify, without any payment whatsoever, work which has been returned to the firm by the customer, on account of bad material being used. It was no fault of the workman, and yet he was allowed no time for it when on day-work, and when on piece-work he did not get any money. I should also like to state that the major portion of the upholstery work done by Maple's is done by boys, improvers. This is most injurious to the trade, as, in addition to the purchaser getting work done in a very inferior manner, the price the work comes out at in the boys' shop is continually being thrust down the men's throats, and they are told they must produce it for a like amount. I might make one statement about the piece-masters bringing in work to the firm. An article is brought from the piece-master, who goes in the front. I have been called down myself two weeks before I left (I can give your Lordships the number of the job), and I was told to bring it in at the same amount or less. I worked on a job, and booked the time I was on, about 2 *l.*, and when the order went down it was sent back, and I was told I would have to take so much time off to make it come out less than the piece-master's job. That was in the show-room. Of course that was only one case; there were several cases; I have been told that. I booked on a job, and then I was told to work hard, and pull up the time. And when I was on piece-work I got what they call a bad week, 4 *s.* or 5*s.*, or 10 *s.* short. As an instance of the work going wrong owing to the inferiority of the materials used, I might mention the Constitutional Club. Some of this work was made in the shop, and a little over six months after it had been delivered I was sent down to the club by the foreman to see the work (it was in the morning room) and to report. I was afterwards

sent down, next morning, with one or two men, and the foreman came with me, and we put five buttons in the easy chairs, which are plain morocco chairs, in order to take the fullness or bagginess out, where they had gone wrong on account of the bad material. Such work as this would not be tolerated in any respectable West-End house. When I went to Maple's, in September 1883, we had a large club on; I am not quite sure of the name, I believe it was the Turf Club. Nearly the whole of the upholstery work was done by boys. The firm is held in such bad repute by the members of the trade generally that many men who have been out of work (and I know many) will not go and work for the firm when orders have been placed on the society's books. I myself have taken orders, and they have declined to come; they prefer to walk all over London for work, or be out of work, rather than go to Maple's. It might be asked of me by your Lordships if men working at Maple's are treated so, why they do not leave. I can only say that men who have worked at Maple's do not find it an easy job to get away from that firm, and when they go looking for work some foremen will refuse them. I myself have been refused.

4530. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Some foremen will refuse them because they have been at Maple's?

Yes. The men in the shop I worked in were told on the 17th March 1887, that they must produce more work, and that in some cases their money must be dropped, in order to compete with the piece-masters; and I told Mr. Imley, the foreman, that I could not do more work, so I packed up my tools and left. Since then I have worked in several West-End houses, got a fair price for my labour, and been treated well.

4531. *Chairman.*] You say that the foremen of other houses refuse men who have worked at Maple's; why is that?

Suppose that the foreman does not know you, and he thinks that you have come from Maple's, perhaps he might think you have learned your trade there, and they do not teach the upholstery business properly, only a part; and it would be no use to go to a West-End house without you were an all-round man.

4532. That is, in your opinion, the reason why they do not take them?

Yes, decidedly.

4533. You said that work was returned by customers when it is of inferior quality; I understood you to say that it had to be made good by the workmen without their having any additional wage?

Yes; I can give names.

4534 Does that occur in other places?

No. I have worked in Meillier's, Lehmann's, Wilkinson's, Gregory's, and Bertram's.

4535. And that has not occurred in any of those places?

No.

4536. Then you complain also that they play off the piece-shop against the day-shop?

Yes, when they had the two shops. But I blame them for employing the boys; they play off the boys against you. I myself had a job in 1885, a Victoria couch in silk and satin; myself and a man named Piper; and when I went to make my book up (it was on piece-work), when I expected about 2 *l.* 5 *s.* or 2 *l.* 10 *s.* between the two of us, he gave us 13 *s.* a-piece, and when I grumbled at the price he said, "That is what it comes out in a boys' shop, and I will pay no more." That meant a row, and if I did not like it they would always tell you the old remedy, to pick up your tools and go. And of course you had to be very careful in asking your price, because you might be told that you had to go.

4537. You never made any bargain?

If we asked the price before we had done the job, he would tell us to go out with our tools.

4538. Lord

4538. Lord *Clinton.*] Were Messrs. Maple making all their goods on their own premises when you were with them?
No, they made part of them.

4539. How many men were employed at that time?
When I went on first I should think about 50 men.

4540. What year was that?
In 1880; and when I left in 1887, I should think there were about 10. The others were all boys and improvers, that is, not practical people; getting about half the money that a man would get.

4541. But the boys, improvers, could not make a whole piece of furniture?
They could make a whole piece of furniture to pass; but a practical man would not pass it.

4542. A sofa, for instance; boys could not make a sofa?
Yes, they could make a sofa; it could go home, and a person who has not a sharp eye would pass it. I have seen many things go home like that that I would not have in my place if I was paying for them.

4543. And those were sold as first-class work, I understand you?
Yes; there are three or four men kept there now at what they call covering or furnishing, and the boys first stuff the job. When they first stuffed some jobs we used to be amused at the way in which they were turned out; instead of looking like an easy chair they looked like a cart wheel. When you had the job to cover you were responsible for the job; I was responsible, for instance, though I did not do any of the first stuffing, which was the principal part of the trade.

4544. *Chairman.*] You mean that you were responsible for it, and yet never did it?
Yes; there was a ticket with my name on it put on the leg, and I had nothing to do with it; and if there was fault found with it, I would get blamed, and many a time I have had to alter boys' work and have not got paid for it, the alterations I never got paid for.

4545. Lord *Clinton.*] Do these goods often come back for alteration?
On the floor where I was there were three cases; the man, Piper, did one and two other men did two more. Of course, in the case of the Constitutional Club, that could not come back, because there was so much of it.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. JOHN BOSWELL RICHARDS, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

4546. *Chairman.*] You are a cabinet maker, are you not?
Yes.

4547. Have you had a long experience in the trade?
About 35 years.

4548. What kind of furniture are you in the habit of making?
A very good class of work, the high class.

4549. Have you anything you want to say to the Committee?
Yes. It is rather a long statement.

4550. If you have heard the evidence that has been given already, do not go over the same ground again?
It has nothing to do with that, I think. I am a cabinet maker and maker of art furniture, and at present carry on a business for my son at 22, Bell Alley, London Wall, E.C., as a maker and dealer in office furniture, fittings, &c., and also as a small manufacturer at 3, Phipps-street, Shoreditch. I was apprenticed for five years to the trade in 1852, and afterwards worked as a journeyman for about nine years. In the year 1866, I commenced business on my own account in

in a small shop in East-road, Hoxton. I commenced with a small capital of 200 *l.*, and began by making furniture for the trade. As I was then unknown in the trade, when I had made a certain quantity of goods, I took them out in a van and called on dealers and offered them for sale. As I became better known I received orders from dealers to make goods for them, which kept me constantly employed.

4551. This statement is apparently an account of your own experience and your own life?

Yes.

4552. Are you going to deduce from it anything affecting the conditions of the trade generally?

Yes, I hope to in the course of time. I got a considerable demand for my work from a large number of firms, all of good standing. Amongst others I may mention Messrs. Hewetson & Milner of Tottenham Court-road, Messrs. Hindley's, of Oxford-street, Messrs. Smee & Son, Finsbury-pavement, Messrs. Hewson & Hornby, of High Holborn, Messrs Jenks & Holt, Bread-street, Cheapside, Messrs. Hunter, Moorgate-street, Messrs. Taylor, Fisher & Blunt, of Fenchurch-street, and many others, all of which were requiring high-class work. I now removed to larger premises at Coleman-street, Bunhill-row. I then started making, as a speciality, ash inlaid work, and of this class of work I had a complete monopoly; as this was very saleable I soon had a large demand for it, and did exceedingly well at it. Up to this time I had never solicited orders from Messrs. Maple & Co., my reason for not doing so being that I had heard of their way of doing business; that they were noted for driving hard bargains, and taking every advantage, and I purposely abstained from seeking orders from them. In the spring of 1871 I was waited upon by a representative of Messrs. Maple & Co., who wished me to send in some of my ash inlaid goods to his firm; I objected to do so for the reasons aforesaid, as well as on the ground that I was afraid it might give offence to my good and regular customers; but as he said they were *bonâ fide* requred for shipping I consented to do so. Messrs. Maples were very pleased with the goods and gave a cheque immediately, but deducted a sum from my price for discount.

4553. How much?

Five per cent. I objected to this, but they stated it was a regular thing with them, and I finally agreed to it. I, however, had never allowed any discount, nor was it the custom of any of the other houses I had worked for to take any, the only exception I know of being that in my first account with Messrs. Jackson & Graham, which was for a rather considerable amount, when I called for payment, the cheque was already drawn and they had deducted something by way of discount from my account. I called the cashier's attention to it; he requested me to take the cheque as it was drawn, and said he would mention it to Mr. Graham. A few days afterwards Messrs. Jackson & Graham sent me on the difference, although I had not made any very special demand for it. From this time, Maples became regular customers, increasing their demand for my work week after week. They also kept pressing me continually to get larger premises and set more men at work. I at length yielded to their persuasion and took larger premises and expended a lot of money laying down plant and machinery, and I also engaged more workmen. The result of this was to lock up all my available capital, and consequently, with more men to pay and with increased expenditure, I found myself suddenly embarrassed for want of ready money. From the time I had been working for Messrs. Maple I had gradually been losing my former connection, and in this way I became more dependent on that firm for work. Soon after setting going the larger premises in Curtain-road Messrs. Maple became aware of my being in need of ready-money, and they arranged with me that if I would give them a charge on my premises, &c., they would allow me to overdraw my account with them by letting me have money from time to time as I required it. I accordingly gave them a charge on my premises. I was now almost absolutely in their power. They then began to put the screw on me, for, finding me in their power, they took every advantage of my position. At certain times they would take as much work as I could possibly produce, and then suddenly stop and take nothing for weeks at a time. As an illustration of this, I find that from the 5th September 1874 to the 23rd of

of the same month, I sent in 918 *l.* 11 *s.* 6 *d.* worth of work, and then I did not sell them a single suite until 23rd November, nearly two months after; and then I find the first item down is a particular pattern, ash suite, at 45 *l.*, although I had sent in several before, and the regular price had been fixed at 50 *l.* 16 *s.* I know Mr. Maple said the other day, addressing his electors at East Dulwich, that all the hard bargains they made were on account of the customers; but the suites were not marked at a lower price in the show-rooms, consequently they, and not the customers, got the benefit. I had the best of workmen, and I could not afford to loose them, as it would have been extremely difficult for me to replace them, and so in these slack periods I had to keep my men at work making stock. Now, of course, was Messrs. Maple's opportunity. I had the stock on my hands, and they knew I must sell it or stop business, because I had no available capital wherewith to hold out against them; so they, on these occasions, would refuse to take my goods unless I took a lower price. I had no alternative but to accept the inevitable, and let them have the goods at the best terms I could get. They had about three or four settlements a year, as a rule, and they would always select the slack time to balance accounts.

4554. You had the money three or four times a year, do you say?

No; every week or every fortnight, and we balanced the account three or four times a year. When my accounts were gone into, I would find that they had taken off various amounts from my invoice, amounting to from five to ten per cent. of the whole amount. This left me too small a margin to be able to carry on my business and pay my way, and I therefore gradually got involved in difficulties, of which they took every possible advantage. One of my largest creditors, finding the way I was thus being sweated, went and paid off their charge; I mean the charge that they had taken on my premises. They sweated me more after they had the charge on my premises——

4555. Earl of *Limerick.*] Did you prepare this statement which you are now reading yourself?

I did; I wrote it myself entirely; I and my daughter, and my son.

4556. You dictated it all yourself?

I dictated it all myself; my son and my daughter between them wrote every word of it. I have the rough notes if you would like to see them; I could not write as well myself. Before the charge was taken off, when they had the charge on my premises, that is when they sweated me more than they could before, because that was when they were sure of the money. I may tell you that they had lent me 1,500 *l.*

4557. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] Will you read on from where you left off?

But although this was done to assist me, it was too late, as my credit had been so far damaged and my old connection had gone, that I found it impossible to pull round. I know several firms who have been ruined in this way by Messrs. Maple, some of whom started with thousands of pounds of capital. Another manifestly unfair practice by Maples upon one was this: As I have explained, I had the best skilled men in my shop that I could get, and also employed good foremen and expensive draughtsmen. It was necessary for me continually to change my patterns, and I always tried to make something they could not imitate, as they would if they could at a lower price. Sometimes I did not succeed in this. As an instance I sent in a walnut and gold suite at 60 *l.*, and they got Messrs. Stevens and Dore to make it for 50 *l.* By these means they defrauded me of the time and expense incurred in getting out a new design, and also the workmen of a considerable sum in wages, as Messrs. Stevens and Dore could not afford at the lower price to pay their men as much as I did mine. I could instance a lot more cases, but I thought one was sufficient. To mention one more case. In April 1873 I made two oak and gold bed-room suites for Maples, which were made for Sir Selwin-Ibbetson. I charged them 331 *l.* 14 *s.*, and had a considerable amount taken off my account. Although I had designed them, made working drawings, produced them, and taken all risks, I know that in the end I got no profit out of them; but I have no doubt that they got at least 100 *l.* without risk or trouble. To explain that more fully: A salesman

gets an order from a customer; a gentleman comes and wants something done; there is not a soul in the place that knows anything about the thing, and they send for a maker who they think does know, and they say, "A customer wants a certain thing." You have to take all the risk of having a drawing made first to submit to them for them to submit to their customers. Eventually you get the order; but if it is one single job you get nothing out of the job at all, because the time and expense on the job is so great; it is afterwards that you get a little working profit. In May 1877 Mr. Regnart sent for me, and told me there was a very large job going that required 300 or 400 bed-room suites; and if I liked to send the best things I could produce suitable for the purpose, in competition with two other houses, whichever one succeeded would get the job. I have purposely avoided mentioning the other houses, because I think they are working for them now. It is well known who they are.

4558. *Chairman.*] You are making for them now?

No; I have ceased this ten years or this eight years. I have had quite enough of it. I immediately asked at what price they were wanted, as I could not compete with the others in price, as the class of goods we produced were so different. Mr. Regnart told me they had no price given, and that they wanted the three qualities to see which their customers would select. I made six suites and sent them in, and also an invoice of my prices. I was requested to attend on a particular day at Messrs. Maples', and I did so. They had the various suites set out in a room specially arranged for the purpose. My suites were selected by their customer, and I was so informed by Messrs. Maples' representative, and I naturally expected the order to proceed with the work. Not having received same, I went and saw Mr. Regnart to know the reason. He referred me to Lunnis, the salesman. Mr. Lunnis then handed me a written order for the goods, but all the prices were 15 to 20 per cent. less than my invoice prices. For instance, the price charged by me for the first item, a six-foot wardrobe was 22 *l.* 15 *s.* Messrs. Maple offered me 18 *l.*, they finding the plate glass, which would be about 30 *s.* in value. I went to Mr. Regnart to know the meaning of this, and he said it was all they could pay; it was all Mr. Blundell's doing, to sell it at the price, and if I did not do it some one else must. Of course, I could not do the suites at the price offered, as, in fact, they would have cost me at least 2 *l.* more than the price Maple offered me. I reckoned it would have cost me 1 *l.* or 2 *l.* more than the price they offered me. Then the goods were offered to, and afterwards made by, one of the other competitors. The price I paid for making the sample wardrobe, and which I should have paid for making the whole, was 8 *l.* 6 *s.* The price actually paid by the other firm was 5 *l.* 15 *s.*, a difference of 2 *l.* 11 *s.* each; and therefore, on this item alone, the workmen were sweated to the extent of more than 1,000 *l.* Now, it must be obvious that if Messrs. Maple had made these samples themselves, they would have had to pay the full labour price for making, and that would have left the other honestly competing firms a much better chance of obtaining the order, and it would also have prevented them from sweating the labour price down to the extent which they actually did.

4559. I do not quite understand what you complain of in this last case which you have mentioned to the Committee. As I understand it, you and two other makers sent suites to Messrs. Maple?

Yes.

4560. And that your suite was selected by the customer?

My pattern, the sample suite; that was the suite that was followed.

4561. That was selected by the customer?

Yes.

4562. But that you did not get the job because they would not give you your invoice price?

Yes.

4563. And that one of your competitors made the furniture?

Made my pattern.

4564. You

4564. You mean to say that your pattern was taken, and therefore what you complain of is that you had the trouble of making the sample, and did not get the work.

That is it, I complain also that the customer is not being well treated either; I state that the customer could not have been well treated.

4565. That he did not get the article he ought to have got?

Certainly not the article he bargained for; but that has nothing to do with me; still I think it is a point that is worth some consideration.

4566. What you complain of is that you had the expense and trouble of making designs and samples that you sent in with your price for them, but that your design being selected you did not get the job, and therefore lost the trouble that you had been put to in getting up the sample.

Yes, because when a thing is once produced it is easy to cut it down. It is not so easy to make a thing first as afterwards. You can easily reduce the width and the ends and the length of the carcase, and make the doors and tops and bottoms thinner, and everything else; it is very easy to sweat it down.

4567. You mentioned that you had discount taken off; sometimes five and sometimes 10 per cent.?

What I intended to convey to your Lordships is this: that I, doing a large amount of trade with them (one month I sent in 900 *l.* worth of goods), I had perhaps a dozen suites in my show-rooms, my patterns, of course. When I had got them there, if they could possibly get them made cheaper, they would. That was manifestly unfair; but then they could get them made cheaper by getting them made commoner.

4568. I think you mentioned in evidence that you found that a discount to the extent sometimes of five and sometimes of 10 per cent was taken off?

I meant that invoices were all going in with these lots of goods; and perhaps Mr. Regnart would ask someone else what he would make my suite for. "I would make it for so much," he would say. Then he would immediately go and take it off my invoice.

4569. That is what you meant by what you said about the discount?

Yes.

4570. Your price being 100 *l.*, if Mr. Regnart found somebody else would make it for 90 *l.*, then 10 *l.* would come off your invoice?

£. 10 would come off my ticket; so that when I came to balance my account I should find myself on the other side of the hedge.

4571. You said also that this firm would sometimes keep you a long time without giving you an order?

Yes. That was on purpose to drag me down to their level.

4572. You say it was on purpose; why do you think so?

There can be no other reason. I have known him go round the show-room and take the tickets off the goods, so that they should not be sold, when he had a little spite, to serve you out.

4573. Do you mean that the demand was always so great that Messrs. Maple could have given you orders all the time?

Certainly, they could have kept it going in a regular manner, only in the other way they got a better chance of putting the screw on. If you get workmen that suit you, you cannot get rid of them at a minute's notice; consequently you have to keep on making the same things; and certain articles suit certain men. I have had men for years at a time making one particular job; they will go on in a regular way if it is anything like a fair way of doing it.

4574. Earl of *Onslow.*] With regard to the first job that you did for Maple, off which they took the 5 per cent. discount, was that practice continued throughout

throughout the whole time that you worked for them?—Yes, they always took a cash discount off.

4575. But then I understood you to say that that was not the general practice in the trade?
Yes; not in any other houses I have ever worked for. I could give you a list of the houses I had worked for previously, if you wish.

4576. No, that is enough; you say it was not the general practice in the trade?
It was not.

4577. How soon after you delivered the goods did they pay you?
I may say that I was paid as they went in, because I could always draw money nearly any Friday night that I liked.

4578. Do other firms pay as the goods go in?
Yes; usually not keeping you longer than Friday night.

4579. Pay on Friday and take no discount?
Some of them do. I believe it has got almost a universal thing in the trade to take discounts; but I do nothing in the trade now; they have had all the trade out of me.

4580. You believe it is a practice which has grown in the trade?
No doubt of it.

4581. Lord *Rothschild.*] You are not in the trade now?
Yes, I am in the trade, but I am not working for the trade.

4582. Working for other people?
Working when I can get it. My son has a small shop in the City.

4583. *Chairman.*] Have you ever in your experience known cheques paid so late that you could not get them cashed?
I never had any trouble with the cheques because I had a banking account; I was in a different position then from what I am now.

4584. Now, you have something, I believe, to say about a Government contract?
Yes, I was going to say a few words about a Government contract. In the year 1875 I executed a Government contract for Messrs. Brew and Claris.

4585. What was the work?
A lot of tables, different kinds of tables, and standards for measuring, and boards, and trestles, and all sorts of things.

4586. Where did it come from, do you know?
It came from the Admiralty; I shall tell you a little further on.

4587. The order came to Messrs. Brew and Claris, and they passed it on to you?
Yes.

4588. Will you proceed with your statement?
When the order was completed, I found it did not pay on the terms I got from them, and having the men and machinery suitable for making same, and having had all the trouble of getting into the way of doing so, I thought I would try to get the order direct from the authorities, and, for that purpose, called at the Admiralty Office, when I was promised I should have the necessary papers for tendering. I never received these papers, although I wrote for them several times. I have subsequently found that a contract has been given to a Mr. Lyle of Bishopsgate-street, who has only an office there; it is given to a man with an office; he has not even got the semblance of even a shop.

4589. Earl of *Onslow.*] What does he call himself?
I am sure I should not like to say.

4590. He

4590. He does not call himself an upholsterer?
No. He may do; I do not know. I think that only actual manufacturing firms should be allowed to tender for Government work, and that the officials responsible for giving out these orders (perhaps I have no business to give my advice here) should be bound to see that the work was actually done by the firm who had obtained the contract, and not passed on by them to others.

4591. When was this?
In 1875.

4592. *Chairman.*] Can you give us the exact date?
I did not put the date down; I have it at home. I can tell you what there was, exactly; everything about it.

4593. That is all you have to say on this point of the Government contract?
Yes. Apart from the commercial aspect of the sweating system, it has, to my mind, a baneful effect from another point of view. When I had my business in full swing with my 60 or 70 men, many of whom had worked for me for from 10 to 15 years, I had a staff of respectable men upon whom I could rely, who were contented and earning an honest and respectable living, who were mostly married men and householders, supporting and bringing up families, and were in reality a support to the institutions of this country, but who are now being replaced by a lot of unskilled, badly paid, underfed foreigners; while some of the former are now out of work, though they possess the best ability and skill, simply because they cannot produce the common class of work so cheaply and plentifully supplied to the public through the medium of a class of tradespeople who deal in articles requiring a special, skilful, and technical knowledge and training, which they have never learned or experienced; hence we have the market glutted with a great quantity of goods, which, on the face, resemble the genuine article, but which, in reality, are a sham and a fraud on the public. If the persons in a large way of business, selling the goods made by others as their own, were prevented from so doing by having on these goods the name of the real maker, the result of this might be, that those persons having a large amount of capital at their command, probably would build their own workshops and really employ the persons necessary to make what they required. This would be beneficial because, firstly, a large body of men would be gathered together in one establishment, and consequently would work only a reasonable number of hours; secondly, they would be under the regulations of certain existing Acts as to the rules, time, and condition of the establishment; thirdly, the present small, unhealthy, and insanitary places where men, women, and children eke out a miserable existence by producing a common class of goods at starvation prices, out of which middle-men make vast fortunes, would be done away with. To sum up, I think the best way of obviating the evils connected with the sweating system would be to compel the manufacturers to stamp their names on all goods made by them, and to render fraudulent any attempt by any person to sell goods as his own manufacture which were not actually made by him. I also think a great benefit will accrue from the public exposure of this system, as I trust that gentlemen knowing now how the goods purchased by them in times past have been made, will in future take steps to ascertain the character of the firm with whom they are dealing, and, as far as possible, give their orders to the actual manufacturers direct.

4594. You have spoken of foreign competition. Now can you give the Committee any details about that; are you aware whether there are any very large number of foreigners engaged in your trade?
Hundreds of them. I know there are large places within a hundred yards of me where they work 14 and 16 hours a day, and Sundays as well.

4595. What nationality do they belong to?
I think mostly Germans and Polish Jews and that sort of thing.

4596. Since when has this been the case?

It has been going on gradually this 15 years, I suppose. The first thing they attacked was the shaped toilets; that appeared to be the first thing they took to, and they got a monopoly of that; and then they went to cabinets; and now they make more bedroom suites than Englishmen, for such a class as they are. I cannot possibly explain to you the real effect of this; you cannot express it in words; you only get it by actual experience. No man can tell what it is except those that have been actually through it; you cannot conceive it in any way.

4597. Do you think that these evils you complain of might be remedied if the name of the manufacturer were stamped upon the goods?
I think it would go a great way towards it, because then people would know that these large places were only middle-men, sweating the profits; because the things are not cheap by the time they come to the consumer. If there is a small profit for a maker and a large profit for the retailer, the goods are no cheaper, not a bit in the world.

4598. You would suggest that all these large houses should be obliged to stamp with their own name the goods they make on their own premises, and stamp the maker's name on the goods that they buy?
Yes, that is one remedy for it.

4599. Earl of *Onslow.*] Did you see the Government contract that you spoke of?
I never saw the contract.

4600. You did not see the terms of it?
No; I have no idea of that.

4601. When you say that you believe that by placing the maker's name on the articles you would achieve the object which, no doubt, you have in view, of raising the rate of wages, do you think it would have the effect of inducing those who want to buy cheap goods insisting on the maker's name being stamped upon them, or do you think they would care in the least whether the maker's name was on them or not.
I think it would raise the standard of the work. Of course a man would have an interest in trying to make a good article.

4602. No doubt it would raise the standard of that work; but do you think that people who care about the standard of work would be deterred from buying work which had not got the name on it?
Yes; because people do not go and buy a thing simply for accommodating the shopkeeper; only because they do not know where else to go.

4603. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Could you give me an idea of the numbers of the foreigners who work in each of these shops; do they work in small gangs, or in large shops?
Mostly in small gangs.

4604. Three or four together?
Yes.

4605. Lord *Monkswell.*] Have you any proposal to make as to the prevention of the immigration of foreigners?
No; I have never studied politics.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

WILLIAM ADAMS is called in, and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

4606. *Chairman.*] ARE you a cabinet maker?
Yes.

4607. Have you heard the evidence that has been given before the Committee to-day?
I have.

4608. Have

4608. Have you anything you wish to say to the Committee; any fresh point you wish to bring out, or anything you wish to corroborate?
Yes. I have been working for Mr. Fuller, of Euston-road, for seven and a half years, and I have been in the line 22 years, and frequently on Saturday, I could not get my wages. He supplied Maple with furniture, and on Saturdays we often could not get our wages.

4609. Why not?
On account of the deductions, and being late of a Friday or Saturday they have been put back till Monday.

4610. I understand you to say that you could not get your wages because Mr. Fuller could not get his payment?
He could not get his payment from Maple & Co.

4611. But you cannot testify to that, can you?
Yes; that is what he has come over and told us himself, that he could not pay to-day as he could not get his money from Maple till Monday.

4612. Have you anything else to tell the Committee?
I have 39 *s.* owing me up to the present time since last July up to December last year?

4613. Have you anything else to state?
I do not think there is anything else.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. JULIUS ADOLPH DEINTJE, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

4614. *Chairman.*] YOU are a cabinet maker?
Yes.

4615. It has been complained of in the Evidence laid before the Committee, that injustice is done, or hardship experienced, by makers of upholstery, in that they have to go to the trouble and expense in getting up designs and drawings and samples which they submit to the firms, and that other people can make them cheaper than they can, and therefore get the benefit of these designs without having to pay for them; does your experience bear that out?
My experience has been very largely that way. I believe that I have produced most special designs of any maker in London. I have continually got out designs. No sooner have I produced an article than it has been copied, remade at a reduced price; but this I do not put down to the big firms, but it is owing to the makers themselves; the most men that copy the goods are competiters, those that compete one against the other. For instance, I have worked for Maple's, I have drawn thousands of pounds from Maple's; I have not drawn 100 *l.* from them this last two and a half years, but I have drawn thousands of pounds when I worked for them about 11 years ago, and I have experienced there that no sooner have I brought in the work than it has been copied, not only by Maple's workers, but out of the show-rooms. Maple's did not copy because then they did not make cabinet work; they have only made chair frames and upholstery; they have never clashed with me in the high-class cabinet of dining rooms.

4616. You complain that your designs are copied by other makers?
Yes, by other makers going in the place?

4617. How could that be avoided?
It cannot be prevented; it is all over the trade alike.

4618. Lord *Clinton.*] Do you mean they are copied by others in Maple's show rooms?
Yes.

4619. Lord *Thring*.] But you do not impute blame to Maple's?

No; there is no remedy for that. I cannot agree with all the men say; they state one thing, and they will not state the other. I do not agree with them. I believe the jealousy of the competitors, the makers, between themselves, is so large, because I have experienced it at Maple's. I have sent in my goods without asking any questions; then I have seen an article of mine has been sold. I have sent it in, and left my invoice on the table, and the following Saturday I have called for my cheques, when the goods have been sold; that has gone on for about a fortnight or three weeks. Then I have seen some other goods come in, by other makers, like them, very much like them, but much reduced in price. This has been the work of competition, the men cutting other men out. The jealousy of makers of me, while I have worked at Maple's, has been tremendous.

4620. *Chairman*.] Have you anything else you wish to say, any other point you wish to bring out?

I have listened here to the evidence. I have worked as a journeyman over 10 years in this country, and out of the 10 years I have worked in Berners-street at Howard and Sons for two years. I have made most money out of any men on the premises.

4621. Have you anything to say about the trade generally; you are now telling us your own personal experience?

About the trade in general, as far as the stamping of the goods is concerned, I believe that would bring more depression upon the working classes, upon the makers at large. In my opinion it would be a good thing to stamp things of foreign importation; but I believe if goods were stamped by outdoor makers, that the seller would have the stamp of those goods which he made himself; he would do away with the purchasing of those articles, and it would drive people out of employment; it would be worse.

4622. You think it would be a bad thing?

Yes; it would be a good thing to have a stamp put on foreign goods as they come in, but I believe it would be a very bad thing to stamp other things, because they will never stamp a bad article if they want to keep their reputation; for their own sake, if it was a bad article, they would sell it.

4623. When you send your goods into a firm do you send in an invoice with them?

Yes.

4624. Do you agree with a former witness; have you ever had any discount taken off?

Yes, I have had numbers of accounts taken off by Maple's at different times, and that I have not been able to help, and I am sure that it is so in every shop; no maker can help it. I cannot always keep the same men on. If I get an order and I am obliged to give a particular man that order, very likely he does not turn me out so good an article as the previous man has done. I have taken the article to be a good article, and sent it to them, and when I send it in they find fault with it.

4625. You mean to say that if discount is taken off, it is because the article you have sent in is inferior?

Because it is inferior; and that is what I have seen dozens and dozens of of times at Maple's and other houses. If they find fault with articles they will take a discount off; and if they are pleased with the goods they will give a pound or two more. At Maple's, Shoolbred's, and any house which I have dealt with, it has been always so, that the makers do not get it when the article is inferior.

4626. You say that discount has often been taken off from you; to what amount?

I dare say it has been taken off when I have drawn cheques there for 60 *l.*, 80 *l.*, or 100 *l.* I used to do about 60 *l.* or 80 *l.* a week with Maple.

4627. How

4627. How much did you have taken off?
Varying from 2 *l.*, it might happen, to 10 *l.*

4628. You mean that when 10 per cent. was taken off it was because the article you sent in was 10 per cent. below its proper value?
Yes; when the article has been ordered, I have not been able for shame sometimes to send it to the people, but have had to sell it at a sale room, and had to lose; but if I could have sent it in I would willingly have taken off 5 *l.* or 6 *l.*

4629. Whenever a discount is taken off it is because of that, is it?
No; there is a discount which everybody knows of.

4630. But what was called a discount by a former witness, I mean?
Then there is always something wrong with the article that they must find fault with; the drawer does not work, or wobbles about, or it is not nicely polished, or some flaw about it; then they take off discount. When they are pleased with the article Maples, or any house in London, always pay the price, and they always have paid the price.

4631. Lord *Thring.*] I understand you to say that whenever you sent in bad goods they took off the price; that whenever you sent in goods, if the price was reduced, it was because they were bad?
There was a fault found with it.

4632. Why did you send it in?
I could not help myself. If I get an order and I have a change of workmen, and there is a flaw in the article, I cannot afford to keep it.

4633. When your workmen did not make the article up to the standard, why did you not make them?
You cannot find out until the man has made the work.

4634. How did Maple find it out, if you could not?
After it is made, I have to sell the work; I cannot remedy it.

4635. After it is made, do not you, before you pass it, see whether it is properly made or not?
I may pass it; but I must sell it.

4636. Do I understand you to say that you, being a master workman, cannot tell whether an article is properly made or is not?
I can.

4637. Supposing a wardrobe is improperly made, you know before you take it to Maple's that it is improperly made?
Yes.

4638. Why send it at all?
I should send it wherever it was ordered.

4639. Why do you not make the man repair the work who has deceived you by bad work?
There I must tell you what you do not know, and what you never will know, I believe, by this table. You take, perhaps, two or three men on in a shop, and give them out an article, or two, or three. One of those men draws his money there every week. You cannot interfere with him. As soon as he begins to bring his work together you see that the man has gone wrong; you speak to him, and say, "This is all wrong."

4640. Do I understand that you are in the habit of paying men habitually for bad work full price?
No, decidedly not. I challenge any mechanic in London or any where else to make a drawing, and after making it to take his coat off, and make it himself.

4641. What you have stated is this: you state (I will name Maple's, as it has been named) that when you have taken goods to Maple's you never have had the price reduced unless the work was bad?
Unless there has been a fault found with it.

4642. I asked you why did not find it out before?
I have found it out.

4643. I further ask why, having found it out, you did not make the men below you pay you for it in the same way that Mr. Maple made you pay him?
Because the man that had started that article had taken his tools off the place and gone, and it had to be finished by another man.

4644. Do you mean that you habitually employ workmen you know are rogues?
I have had men working for me this last eight or ten years who are very faithful servants; but you cannot tell beforehand.

4645. Earl of *Onslow.*] Is not the point this: that whereas Messrs. Maple only pay you for the article when it is finished and brought in, you have to pay the workman his wages from time to time, and have not an opportunity of seeing whether his work is going to be finished in a proper manner or not?
Exactly so.

4646. Lord *Thring.*] Do not you employ the same men habitually?
There is not a firm in London that does employ the same men.

4647. Suppose a man made me a bad wardrobe last week, and I have paid him entirely for it, and then he comes and asks me to employ him again, and I do employ him again, I shall surely deduct from the wages for the next wardrobe the proper deduction from the price paid before; do not you do the same?
No; when a man has made me a bad article I send him away and have no more to do with him; that is my way of doing business. He gets his money, and I must get the best I can for the article made; he does not make a second for me; I employ none but first-class men.

4648. And yet they are constantly making bad articles, you say?
I never said that; I said that on very few occasions I had had money deducted by Maple's, but that when money has been deducted it has been on account of fault being found with the article.

4649. Then you say this, that occasionally the price has been deducted on the article supplied, and that you have suffered a loss necessarily because you could not get it from your workmen?
Exactly so.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. *Arnold White* complains that, before the examination of the last witness, a communication took place between him and Mr. Regnart, Messrs. Maple's manager.

The Committee-room is cleared.

After a short time the public are re-admitted.

8th June 1888.

Mr. ARNOLD HENRY WHITE, having been re-called; is Examined, as follows:

4650. *Chairman.*] I WANT clearly to understand what it is that you allege. As I understand you, you state that, according to your opinion, or your knowledge of what was in the statement of the last witness, and what he was going to say, the witness has in some manner been interfered with; is that what you say?
That is so; he was down on the list of witnesses, and I was informed early this morning that he was going to change.

4651. I do not wish to go into detail, merely to ask you exactly what you state?
I will endeavour to answer as briefly as possible. He was on the list of witnesses furnished to your Lordships; I was informed in the middle of the day that communications had taken place between him and Messrs. Maple's manager.

4652. Can you prove that?
I shall prove it by two witnesses in the room. That being the case I purposely refrained from calling him, and as I have been put to a very large expense in this matter, and have given a great deal of time to it, I felt seriously prejudiced by the Committee insisting on calling a witness whom I had the gravest reason to suspect, and who by the evidence of two witnesses in the room now, can be shown to have been in communication with Messrs. Maple's manager; that could not have been for any good purpose.

4653. You allege that the last witness has been tampered with by Messrs. Maple's manager?
That is my inference.

4654. And do you propose to bring evidence to substantiate that?
I propose to call two gentlemen in the room.

4655. Do you propose to bring evidence to substantiate that statement?
To call two men who saw him talking to Mr. Regnart. What had he to say to Mr. Regnart, or Mr. Regnart to him?

4656. Lord *Thring.*] What do you want to prove?
All I ask to prove by the two witnesses is that communications were seen to take place to-day, and I was also told that the man was not going to give the evidence he said he would.

4657. Can you prove by a witness the nature of the communication that passed?
No, I have not the least knowledge of that.

4658. All you prove is that at a certain time to-day these two men were seen talking together?
Yes.

4659. Nothing more than that?
No, nothing more than that, except that he has varied his evidence. That is *post hoc* not necessarily *propter hoc.*

4660. He has varied his evidence from what?
From a declaration which he had made. I leave your Lordships to judge from his answer about the 10 per cent. deduction, as to which he told your Lordships

Lordships that he was invariably in the wrong; which was not what he stated to us.

4661. Your complaint is that the evidence which the witness gave was not in accordance with what you expected him to give?

Yes, that is so.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Martis, 12° *Junii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord ARCHBISHOP of CANTERBURY.
Earl of DERBY.
Earl of ONSLOW.
Viscount GORDON (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord CLINTON.
Lord CLIFFORD OF CHUDLEIGH.
Lord FOXFORD (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord MONKSWELL.
Lord THRING.

LORD KENRY (EARL OF DUNRAVEN AND MOUNT-EARL), IN THE CHAIR.

MR. ARNOLD HENRY WHITE, having been re-called; is further Examined, as follows:

4662. *Chairman.*] YOU were good enough to say some time ago that you would be prepared to make a statement of the evidence as to the sweating system in reference to the Government Departments, or Government contractors; are you now prepared to do so?

I am prepared to do so as far as regards the army accoutrement work. The statement will take a very short time. I have witnesses to prove the facts.

4663. Do you propose to go into any other branches of the subject?

I have collected evidence and witnesses with regard to Chatham and other Government work; but I am obliged, as your Lordship knows, to leave for South Africa next week, and I will place in the hands of the Committee the whole of the evidence I have collected, and the names of the witnesses, but I shall not be able to conduct the thing myself. I shall attempt to show the existence of sweating in the army accoutrement work by the presence of the three elements of sub-contracting, long hours (so long that a 16-hour day is called an army accoutrement day), and low wages. Now, there is no reason to suppose that the taxpayer does not pay an adequate sum for the various accoutrements, details of which will be brought before your Lordships; but it will be shown that before the payment reaches the hands of the workman, a considerable proportion of it sticks *en route* in the hands of the middle-man. The trade is a limited one. Formerly it was, like army clothing in the hands of the colonel of each regiment, and resulted in the work being given to a number of army contractors. These firms supplied the leather themselves, and then gave the work out to practical workers whom they knew, and whose capacity they knew, and these men prepared the work for sewing, and employed others with themselves to sew it. Good prices were then paid, and the men's statements show a very small sum formed of sub-contractors' remuneration for preparing the work. There was formerly an Army Accoutrement Society and Trades Union, but it died six months ago because one of the principal contractors sent the work away to Walsall rather than employ union men. About the time of the Crimean War, and shortly afterwards, the army contractors had very heavy orders. Formerly they were only for hundreds of a certain article, but then they were for tens of thousands. Then the "sweater" came in; there were several of

 them,

them, and they offered to take the whole of an order, and release the contractor of the trouble of finding the labour. The contractor continued, and still continues, to find the leather and to cut it. Most of the sweaters employed were not practical men at all; the principal one was a potman; another a draper's assistant. These men, by constantly offering to take the work at a lower price than the workers or piecemen, have obtained a practical monopoly.

4664. Earl of *Onslow.*] When was this; is this recently?
This is comparatively recently. The great lowering in wages, which I shall show, has happened in the last two or three years, without any diminution in the price paid by the Admiralty and the War Office.

4665. But when the potman took the contract, is that recently or some time ago?
The principal one, whom I have not mentioned by name, was a potman formerly. He takes contracts now; but that was mentioned to show that he was not a practical saddler, not a practical accoutrement maker, but was a man like the knifer in the boot trade, who was ignorant of his work.

4666. Do you say that that man is taking contracts now?
That man is taking contracts now.

4667. *Chairman.*] He has been taking them then ever since the Crimean war, has he?
He has been taking them for some time; I have not on my notes how long he has been at it. These men, by constantly offering to take the work at a lower price than the workers or piecemen, have obtained a practical monopoly; for the work being of a special nature and limited, the workers were bound, if the sweaters obtained the contract, to work for them at their own prices or starve, there being no other opening for that class of labour. All the men seen agree that it is impossible to make a living at it, the average price paid less than 3 *d.* an hour. The work is very hard and requires skilled labour. Most of the men have learned their trade thoroughly and are practical men. The workmen have to find their own hemp, thread, wax, and grease, which on many articles is considerable, and so little supervision seems to be exercised at the depôts, that the men admit that the work they have recently done for the principal sweaters who sub-contract with the army contractors, Ross, Almond, Hebbert, &c., at the low prices they pay, is done with 2-and-3-cord thread instead of 5-cord thread.

4668. Earl of *Onslow.*] Where do these men reside and do their work?
In the district of Bermondsey mostly.

4669. Any of them in the East End?
Bermondsey is the South, not the East End.

4670. Do you call Bermondsey the East End of London?
I call Bermondsey the South, the South-east.

4671. Is any of it done at Whitechapel and Bow?
Not to my knowledge. If your Lordship looks at the map of London, you will see that Bermondsey may be said to be in the East End of London; if you draw a dividing line midway through the centre of the great circle, it is South-east. They allege further, that in recent years many contractors who would not employ two sweaters, named Potten and Squires, could not obtain a contract because they would not fee officials, and that if a small quantity of work was obtained by them, it was rejected, although good work, for the same reasons, but that most of the other work passed the viewers, and they allege that work rejected when supplied by other contractors has been passed. Several contractors have recently been struck off the list at the Admiralty for bad work, notably Ross. Their businesses, however, are extant, being carried on under other names. Ross endeavoured to cheapen the work by opening premises at Walsall, near Birmingham, and obtaining women labour, but it resulted in heavy rejections, and, it is alleged, a claim upon him for very large damages. I sent down to Walsall with the object of getting some of the women before your Lordships'

Lordships' Committee, but the results of my investigations do not prove that the work there is by any means carried on under insanitary conditions or for great length of hours; that is confined, so far as I can discover, to London. The work also is most irregular, and it is a very precarious trade. When in work it is common for the men to work from 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. The following is a description of the principal articles made by the accoutrement makers, and an epitome of the evidence that I have collected from the men in the course of these inquiries I will just read this through to your Lordships, because witnesses will constantly be making reference to it. Cartridge Pouches for the Navy: These are delivered to the workmen to do the blocking and sewing. The blocking is, obtaining the required shape in the leather before cutting it out, by damping the leather and hammering it upon a shaped block; then they sew it; there are three sizes, viz., for 20, 30, and 36 rounds, known by the numbers. The present price paid by Potten, Squires, and Corin (and one of these sweaters will be called before your Lordships) is 3*s.* 3*d.* a dozen for 20's, 3*s.* 4*d.* for 30's, and 3*s.* 5*d.* for 36's, and it takes two-and-a-half hours to make one. A rapid workman might make them slightly quicker. Then the witnesses will tell you, with regard to these different articles, that the prices paid by the sweaters to them have, in the course of the last few years, for identical articles, been reduced by as much as 50 per cent., which is the main point I want to establish. Passing now to Buff: These are the ordinary Regulation Infantry Privates' Pouches. Formerly the price was 4 *s.* 6 *d.* to the worker. By 1886 it had been reduced to 3 *s.*, by 1887 to 2 *s.* 6 *d.*, and now 2 *s.* only is paid by Potten, although Davis is paying 2 *s.* 6 *d.* still. Ross had them made for 1 *s.* 9 *d.* in his workshop by women, the same thing which was paid 4 *s.* 6 *d.* for previous to 1886. The work to be done upon them is to sew round them, fix two large loops at back and one small one, put on a square patch piece with a dee and billet, stud, stay in front, and stay piece, cap piece, jag loops and gusset. In a day of 15 hours nine can be made by a good workman, which, at 2*d.*, is less than 1¼*d.* an hour. When Ross offered 2*s.* per dozen he put the matter in this way: "I can get them done at Walsall for 2*s.*, and if you will do them at that you can; if not, I will send them to Walsall." He made this offer direct to the workers, and not through the sweaters. Westley-Richards is a Black Pouch: These are for cavalry only; there are very few made. It is considered good work as regards price; 6 *s.* per dozen has recently been paid; the former price was 9*s.* per dozen a few years ago. Waist Belts: These are the ordinary Regulation Waist Belts. The work done is to sew the belt both sides, fix two patches behind two buckles, and one safe and slide loop. Formerly what is called buckling was not done by the worker but by the preparer; and in 1885 the price, without buckling, was 2*s.* per dozen; the price now is 1*s.* per dozen complete, and a good workman can make 15 in 12 hours, and thus earn 1 *s.* 6 *d.* a day of 12 hours. Ammunition Bag (Red Sea Service): This is made to carry 10 rounds. There is a gusset sewn on front and back, one stud to fix and hole to punch, one billet and two back loops, and places to make for two oil bottles. They take over one hour to make, and it is heavy work to do 10 a day for a good workman. Potten does not appear to have contracted for these. The price is 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a dozen, which comes out 2½ *d.* an hour. Frogs (Buff): This is the leather piece attached to the belt in which the scabbard hangs. A good workman can make two dozen in a day of 15 hours, for which he receives 2 *s.* 6 *d.* or 3 *s.*, the price being 1¼ *d.* and 1½ *d.* each. Three years ago the 1¼ *d.* article was paid at 1½ *d.*, and a 1½ *d.* article was paid at 1¾ *d.* Davis is now paying 9 *d.* per dozen only, equal to ¾ *d.* each, for plain ones. Valises: These are leather kit bags for the infantry. The work done to them by the worker is to sew the back, called "backing." "Fronts," "corner pieces" seams called "seaming," and the "gussets" and to "welt" them. It takes a good man a day of 15 hours to fit a dozen backs; a dozen gussets and fronts together take seven hours; seaming takes six hours to do 24 seams, that is, the seams for 12 valises. A quick man doing the whole work might finish four in a day of 15 hours; an average man only three. The price for the whole of the work paid now by Potten, Almond direct, and Briggs direct, is 7½ *d.* This is made up as follows: Seaming, 2 *d.*; backing, 3 *d.*; front, 1½ *d.*; corner piecing, 1¼ *d.*; and gusset, ¾ *d.*

4672. *Chairman.*] By "direct," you mean without the intervention of sweaters?

Without the intervention of sweaters. Briggs and Almond, who are contractors, are dealing direct with the workmen.

4673. Lord *Sandhurst.*] Sevenpence-halfpenny means 7½ *d.* per valise?

Yes; and welting 2 *d.* per day; altogether 7*s.* 8*d.* a dozen. The pattern is the 1882 pattern. It is partly machined before it is handed out by the sweater. Five years ago the price paid by Potten was 1 *s.* 0½ *d.*, as follows: seaming, 3*d.*, backing, 4 *d.*, front gusset, 2½ *d.*, corner piecing and welting, 3 *d.*, making, 1*s.* 0½ *d.* So that although I cannot discover that the price paid by the War Office to the contractor is any less, there has been a reduction since 1882 from 1*s.* 0½ *d.* to 7½ *d.*, and of course the profit has been intercepted by the middle-man. Havresacks: These are wholly machined, and are made by women only. One woman seen has received lately 3¾ *d.* per dozen from Potten. The worker finds the thread. There are three girls engaged by Mr. Potten at this work on his own premises. It is considered good work, and 18*s.* a week has been earned. Kitbags: This is a canvas bag, the shape of a valise, with one strap, two buttons, and one buckle in leather. The present price is 2¼ *d.* per dozen. This is mostly women's work. Reins, Driving (for a pair of Horses): These are sometimes handed out to the workers to prepare as well as sew. Bridoon: They are the reins attached to the head collar for riding purposes. Present price, 1¼ *d.* each. A man earns 3¾ *d.* an hour at this work. He can make three pairs. Shaft Tugs with four substances: These are the tugs through which the shafts pass. They are very hard work. They are sewn seven stitches to the inch; they are 22 inches in circumference. The present price is 6*d.* each; the former price, eight years ago, was 9 *d.* each. The time required to make one is one and a-half or two hours' hard work. The hemp and wax and grease alone cost 3 *d.*, leaving 3 *d.* for two hours' very hard work, or 1½ *d.* per hour; and subsequent witnesses will tell your Lordships that in order to get more work done the work is scamped; that not so many stitches are put to the inch as they ought to put; and the thread (of which I have a sample somewhere) instead of being the strong 5-cord thread according to specification, is thread of a much weaker nature, much cheaper to buy, as the worker has to find it, and that therefore the army is supplied with these accoutrements of an adulterated nature, caused by the necessities of the workmen, and not by the low price paid by the War Office. Backband: This is the band which runs through the saddle to which the shaft tugs are attached, and fastens underneath the belly of the horse. It is four feet six inches in length, sewn seven stitches to the inch, and takes over three hours. The present price is 1 *s.* each. The hemp, wax, and grease cost 3 *d.*, and are found by the worker. It is very hard work. There is a running loop and buckling, which take over half an hour alone to make. Breechings: In these there are three tugs to be made, and one strap to be sewn. There is one lay (or smaller piece to be sewn in a larger piece, and requiring care to fit it in the centre) and two billets. The price paid is 2*s.* 3*d.*, and it was divided thus: lay and body, 1*s.*; small tugs, 9*d.*; two billets, 6*d.*, making 2*s.* 3*d.* It takes a whole day to make, and is very hard work. Head Collars: For the sewing 4½ *d.* is now paid; in a day of 15 hours a good man can make six only, thus earning 2*s.* 3*d.* a day of 15 hours. Leggings for Drivers: These are made of solid brown leather, with three straps and buckles, with a lay the whole length, and four rows of seven to the inch sewing; there are not many given out; most of them have recently been made at Walsall by women; about 2*d.* an hour can be earned at these, the recent pay is 4¾ *d.* per dozen. Canvas Infantry Black Leather Shoe Pocket: There are two patterns, the small or old, and large or new; the small ones are paid at 3*s.* a dozen, the large at 4*s.* a dozen, by Squires. It takes a man one and a half hours to make one. I have had of course in this inquiry, as in the others, the greatest difficulty in getting the men to speak; it is almost impossible; but I have endeavoured in this inquiry, as in the others, on no account to call any witness before your Lordships as to whose character I have not endeavoured personally to satisfy myself, and the men who will speak to-day are all of them men whom I have reason to believe to be of thoroughly good character.

character. I just want to draw your Lordships' attention to a Blue Book which was published this year, being the "Report by the Judge Advocate General of an Investigation into certain Transactions in connection with the Inspection and Reception of certain Leather at the Ordnance Store Department at Woolwich, with Minutes of Evidence, and Appendix."

4674. *Chairman.*] Do you propose to put any part of that in?

A very small portion; one table showing the connection between sweating and rejections for the public service, showing what a bad thing it is for the public service; and I also propose to read two paragraphs. The table to which I allude is on page 76, and is headed, "Summary of Accoutrements." There are 15 contractors; I have divided these contractors into three bodies, according to the information I have obtained from the men, those who pay their men well, those who pay their men badly, and those who pay their men very badly. Now, it is a most extraordinary coincidence that the contractors who pay their men well have hardly any rejections at all, the work being good, but of the very bad payers the rejections amount, in one case, to 57 per cent. The good payers are Wilde & Company, Middlemore, and Dolan. The primary rejections on over 300,000 articles for those three firms, in the case of Wilde & Company, were 0·3 per cent. (that was only for 1,900 articles); in the case of Middlemore, who furnished 291,205 articles, the primary rejections were only 2·48; and in the case of Dolan & Company——

4675. What do you mean by "primary rejections"?

Sometimes an article is sent back again, and there is a second rejection.

4676. Was that the case in any of these?

That I do not know; I only know about the primary rejections. In the case of Dolan & Company, out of 44,000 articles the primary rejections were only 3·80. I will now take three of the very bad payers: Mason & Sons, out of 30,400 articles, had primary rejections to the number of 43·34 per cent.; Leckie & Company, out of 27,232 articles, had primary rejections to the number of 47·43 per cent.; and Bramston & Company, out of 5,840 articles, had 3,370 returned rejected, amounting to 57·70 per cent., pointing to a distinct connection between bad work and bad pay.

4677. Lord *Clinton.*] You propose, I suppose, to give evidence as to the pay?

Yes, the men themselves will give evidence as to that; I cannot speak from personal knowledge.

4678. But you have witnesses here who will speak to that?

The witnesses will give evidence as to the pay. That, I think, concludes the statement I want to make to the Committee.

4679. *Chairman.*] I will ask you a question or two on the evidence you have just given. You have mentioned just now, quoting from that report, the fact that with regard to these contractors who, you say, pay very bad wages, a large percentage of their goods are rejected; and a little while before that you told us that, owing to the pressure put upon the workmen, they used badly worked-up material, and that the Government are supplied with an inferior article, although they pay a good price for it. It appears to me that the two statements are of a rather conflicting character. If the inferior workmanship was rejected, I do not see how it can be the case that the Government have badly worked-up material?

The point struck me, and I put the same question to the men in the course of that inquiry, and the men told me, as they will tell your Lordships, that the articles that are passed of contractors paying bad wages are not by any means equal to the articles made by contractors paying a good rate of wages.

4680. Now you told us of drivers' leggings being made at Walsall by women; I forget who the contractor was; Mr. Ross, I think. Do you object to the fact that they are made by women at Walsall, or do you object to it on the ground that the articles are inferior, not well made?

I do not think that I have raised any objection to their being made at Walsall, though I have this objection, that their being sent to Walsall to be made had for its effect an artificial lowering of the rate of wages hitherto paid for that article.

4681. That is to say, that the women's labour competed with the men's labour?

The women's labour had the same effect in lowering the price as the pauper foreigner has on the boot trade.

4682. You do not mean us to understand that the article is not well made by the women?

No; as far as my inquiries have gone at Walsall I think the work is extremely well done.

4683. And your main contention is that, during the last five years or so, there has been a considerable reduction?

Since 1885, I will say; I have mentioned one case of 1883, but the extraordinary fall of wages has taken place as recently as 1885.

4684. In the last two or three years?

In the last three years.

4685. The Government paying the same price?

As far as I know; I am not able to say that; I have tried to find out. I cannot learn that there has been any reduction on the estimates, and I have every reason to believe that they do pay the same price; but your Lordships will ascertain that, of course.

4686. When you speak of "workers," as you have done, do you mean the people who actually make the articles?

The people actually manipulating the articles.

4687. You have not given us anything, or only very little, about sub-contracting; is it the case that, generally speaking, the contractors give out the work straight to the workers?

No, they employ sweaters; the trade, as I said at the beginning, is a very limited one, and the number of firms employed in it are very few. By far the largest is Ross, who is the principal contractor, and he sub-lets to sweaters, of whom Potten is the chief. One of these sweaters, Mr. Corin, is in the room I believe, and he will be able to describe to your Lordships the system as it works, though I need hardly say, he will not criminate himself by any statements he will make.

4688. What I wanted to know was whether, as far as you know, generally speaking, the work goes through the hands of sub-contractors?

Generally speaking; I know of two cases where the contractors work it direct, but, generally speaking, it is a sub-contracting trade.

4689. You spoke just now about its being necessary in some cases to fee officials?

That is what the men allege; there is a great deal about that in this Leather Committee's Report.

4690. Are there any witnesses in the room who will speak of that?

There is a Mr. Dunn, who was a receiver, who no doubt will answer questions put to him by your Lordships, and I think you will find that that is his opinion. In the Report of the Judge Advocate General, and on the evidence taken before that Commission, there is no paragraph stating that actual bribing of the viewers did take place, but I have no more doubt of it than that I am sitting in this chair; and that it is practically universal, not only in that, but in the army clothing trade.

4691. Are all the accoutrements made by contractors?

Since the making was taken out of the hands of the colonels of the regiments.

4692. The Government make none themselves?

Of

Of course I know nothing about that; I am only speaking of the sub-contracted trade.

4693. Earl of *Onslow.*] Do you know what has been the state of the leather market between the years of 1883 and 1888?
I believe there has been a fall in the price of leather.

4694. Do you know whether that has been equal to the fall in the amount of wages?
That I cannot say; but I can say that the contractor finds the leather himself and gives out the work. Certainly, the fall in the leather market has not been 50 per cent. or 40 per cent. since 1885.

4695. I think you said you did not know what the price of the Government contract was?
No, I do not.

4696. Then if the price of the Government contract varied in accordance with the value of leather, would that, to your mind, be equivalent to the Government contract remaining the same as regards the labour?
Obviously.

4697. Do you propose to offer any evidence of accoutrements other than those made of leather?
No.

4698. You are aware that there are a good many accoutrements that are not made of leather?
Yes.

4699. I understand you to say that the factory at Walsall is conducted in a satisfactory manner?
The work at Walsall is satisfactorily done, as far as we can discover, in the workers' homes. I have heard great rumours of sweating there.

4700. But its establishment has had the effect of reducing the price in London?
That is what the men allege.

4701. Do you think that any extension of factories, such as this at Walsall, would have the effect of driving the trade out of London altogether?
There is no factory at Walsall; it is done in the workers' homes, as I understand it.

4702. *Chairman.*] You mean that the contractor sends the work down to Walsall to some agent there, instead of giving it out to be done in London?
Yes.

4703. Earl of *Onslow.*] I think you said you have made special inquiry into the character of the witnesses you are proposing to call; may I ask what you mean by that; do you mean as to their position?
As to their record, and the opinion held of them by their fellows.

4704. As to their conduct and their veracity?
And their general character. I felt that it was far more important to have a few men of good character, against whom nothing could be justly said, than it was to crowd the Committee-room with half-a-hundred people of no character at all. That is why I did not call one witness last time.

4705. Earl of *Derby.*] You speak of masters who paid badly; do you mean by paying badly, only, that they pay lower rates than others, or do you mean that they pay irregularly, and that they in any manner defraud their workmen?
In speading of them as paying badly, I am quoting the workmen's term, and I mean that they pay lower wages and exact a larger amount of work at the same price than other masters.

4706. You said something, which I did not quite follow, about an artificial

lowering of wages caused by sending the work to certain places; what do you mean by an artificial lowering of wages?

By the act of introducing women as competitors with men; I call that an artificial lowering of wages; whether it is a wrong or a right use of the term I do not know.

4707. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] You do not mean that it is only a temporary lowering of wages?

Not so long as women are employed in competition with men.

4708. You do not mean that the work can only be done for a certain amount of time, and that, therefore, it is artificial, that it is not a permanent thing?

No, I do not mean that.

4709. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] The classification of contractors as good payers, bad payers, and very bad payers, is yours?

On information obtained from the workmen.

4710. And the rejections you have given us are taken from the documents in the Blue Book?

Yes, I have divided the 15 contractors into three lists, on information which I have obtained from the men.

4711. And the rejections you have gained from the Blue Book?

Yes; the point I want to make is this that it is sometimes the cheapest thing to pay good wages.

4712. And that is the principle upon which some do pay higher than others?

I believe the firm of Middlemore of Birmingham, who are notoriously good masters, are extremely well served; they have the lowest average of rejections but one, and only a very few articles were supplied by the contractor that had fewer rejections than Middlemore.

4713. Then no artificial step produces a lowering of their wages; the artificial lowering of wages you spoke of does not affect those firms?

No.

4714. They still continue to pay good wages, to get good work, and to have few rejections?

So far as I know.

4715. And their lies their profit?

Yes.

4716. Lord *Monkswell.*] I should like to ask you whether you have any evidence with regard to employing three-strand thread instead of five-strand thread, and evidence that work has been passed which contains less than seven stitches to the inch, which there ought to be; because it is not a matter on which there ought to be any difference of opinion?

I have brought witnesses who will tell you; I had the specific thread to submit to the Committee, but I am afraid I have left it at home.

4717. Earl of *Onslow.*] Have you been down to Walsall or sent anyone down there?

I have sent there.

4718. And you have ascertained the fact that there is not a factory there?

I understand that to be the case.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

12*th June* 1888.

MR. JOHN THOMAS MORRISON, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

4719. *Chairman.*] WHAT is your business?
Harness maker.

4720. You have heard the statement made by Mr. Arnold White?
Yes.

4721. What particular points in it do you wish to give evidence upon?
I wish to state to your Lordships that the accoutrement-making business has come under my personal observation, particularly during the past 15 years, during which period I have held the position of Secretary to the Saddle and Harness Makers' Trades Union of London. If your Lordship will permit me, I will read a statement that I have prepared giving my views upon this matter.

4722. You are in work yourself at this?
Yes.

4723. Your statement will be of things within your own knowledge?
Quite so. As secretary of the saddle and harness makers of London, I have been brought into frequent contact with the system of working on military accoutrements, at which a good few of the workmen of my own trade are compelled to work during the slack periods, as their last resource when all other chances of work have failed them, owing to the miserable prices resulting from the practice of the contractors giving the work out to sweaters at competition prices. Ross & Co., of Grange-road, Bermondsey (now trading as Smith, Palmer, and Collison) are, or were, the principal contractors.

4724. Do you know that fact of your own knowledge, that Ross & Co. are trading as Smith, Palmer, and Collinson?
Yes. They are, or were, the principal contractors, employing some of the worst class of sweaters in London, who take advantage of quiet times to command the labour of men, women, and children, that are compelled to accept their miserable terms to avert actual starvation. In Birmingham and Walsall considerable work is done for the Government. One firm in Birmingham, noted for sending out the best of army work and who have the fewest number of rejections, insist on the men who prepare and finish the work, paying the stitchers an equitable price, as arranged between the men and sanctioned by the firm. Another firm, viz., Mason, of Bath-row, in that town, does not adopt the same system, the latter firm being notorious for low wages, in consequence of which their number of rejections are in excess of the firm previously alluded to.

4725. Might I ask you how you know the practice of this firm in Birmingham?
By communication with the workers there; men that have worked for them.

4726. Are they members of your society?
Yes, some of them are. Walsall is renowned as being a town of sweaters, and there the system exists in its worse form. From personal observations I am enabled to say, that where the stitchers are at the mercy of the sweaters there the greatest amount of misery and degradation abounds. I beg to compare the prices of W. Middlemore of Birmingham, who arrange with their preparers and finishers to pay a stipulated price for stitching with the firm of Ross & Co., &c., who, through the sweaters pay the worst of prices. Middlemore, for instance, for shoe pocket with hinge and strap, pays 5 *s.* per dozen; the small shoe pocket without hinge and strop 4 *s.* per dozen. Potten, one of Ross & Co.'s sweaters, pays for the same articles 4 *s.* and 3 *s.* per dozen. For shaft tugs, Mr. Middlemore pays 1 *s.* 9 *d.* per pair; Potten pays for Ross & Co. 1 *s.* per pair. I beg to submit to your Lordships a sample of a shaft tug (*exhibiting it*). I show this to your Lordships as a portion of work that is of a very hard and laborious character. Attached to that is a back-hand.

 4727. What

4727. What is that used for?
It goes through the saddle to hold up the shafts.

4728. Of what?
Of any cart or baggage waggon. This passes through the saddle and comes out the other end, and has a corresponding tug on the other side. For the back-hand Ross & Co. pay the sum of 1 *s.* for stitching. Leckie, through his sweaters at Walsall, pays the sum of 11 *d.* for the tug (and the military tug is a trifle larger than this); there is paid by Middlemore 1 *s.* 9 *d.* per pair; by Potten 1 *s.* per pair, showing, I would submit to your Lordships that where the system is adopted, as it is by Middlemore, of exacting a price list of the prices that their stitchers shall get, they fare better than those who are left to the mercy of sweaters, as at Ross'. Mr. Arnold White spoke about the thread. I have samples of the thread (*producing some samples*). That thread (*pointing*) would be a five-cord of what they call two-penny brown; that (*pointing*) is the article from which the thread is made. The workmen who are called upon to provide the thread out of the 1 *s.* per pair, in order to save what little they can (I am not going to say that they act honestly, but they do have one little thing in mitigation of their dishonesty, they are not acted honestly by), put in a two-cord or three-cord thread. A two-cord means twisting together; that (*pointing*) would be a two-cord; a five-cord would be that twisted round as we twist it here (*pointing*), making a compact thread; the stronger the thread the greater the strength you get in the article. Your Lordships will observe in this round tug (*pointing*) that the stitches at the bottom are bursting out; it is necessary in this work in particular that it should be very strongly pulled in, as we term it, because where the stitch is hidden it is there the friction does not apply to the thread, and the article lasts longer. In Walsall and Birmingham, I am sorry to say that young girls and women do this terrible heavy work. At the bottom here, you will see that tug is worn thin through the friction of the shaft; this (*pointing*) would be about the usual substance, as we term it, when first made; seven to the inch is the Government stitch which is required. For breechings with straps Mr. Middlemore pays 2 *s.* 6 *d.* each; Potten, and others in London, pay 2 *s.* 3 *d.* each; for plank straps Middlemore pays 5 *d.* per dozen; Potten and others, 3 *d.* per dozen. With regard to shaft tugs and back bands, I have explained as to the hardness of the work; all other articles are proportionately paid for; for I find on going through the prices with those whose misfortunes have compelled them to work at army saddle, harness, and accoutrement work, that for long days of 15 hours per day they cannot obtain at the sweaters' prices but an average of 2½ *d.* per hour. In the majority of instances the stitchers are compelled to do the work at their own homes, by such means bringing their wives and children into the work and depriving the workman of the pleasures of his home. I might state, in correction of Mr. Arnold White, that in Walsall the majority of the work in the accoutrement way is certainly done at the homes of the people, but Leckie has a factory in which his work is done. Whilst I have no desire to shield the sweater, I wish to point out that he does not escape being sweated; in the firm of Ross & Co., the foremen on that establishment are permitted to take work out and get it done; it is needless to say those people do not take out the worst paying articles; the sweater, if he refuses to take out the leavings of the foremen, is punished by being kept without work and incommoded by the petty tyranny of the foreman. Again, the sweater is not left by the contractor to do as he may wish; in great coat straps (that is straps for wrapping round coats to strap them to the soldier's back) the contractor will not allow the sweater to punch the straps, but deducts from these articles 6 *d.* per 100 for punching, done by boys, who can, without an effort, earn the contractor 1 *s.* per hour, against 3 *d.* obtained by the workman. The net result of sweating in the leather trade is bad work for the Government, hard labour, and a bare existence for the worker, and large fortunes for the contractor. I have no hesitation in assuring your Lordships that workmen of my trade, through the existence of the tribe of sweaters, have been brought to the lowest condition of life in being taxed by the sweater at every

every turn. Not only do they charge a halfpenny (and I may state that till recently a penny was charged) in the shilling on money advanced, but they are compelled to purchase the hemp that cost the sweater twopence per ball at a profit of halfpenny on each ball. This is being done by Potten, of Earl's-road, Old Kent-road. I may state to your Lordships also that in the investigations which I have recently made into the accoutrement business, I find that in Bermondsey there are about 20 sweaters existing who employ close upon 200 men. The work of accoutrement making is spasmodic; it depends upon the orders given by the Government; and in giving your Lordships the prices which I have been giving you I give them to you as the prices earned by the men when their trade is brisk. I think I should be safe in saying that for four months out of the year those men are standing idle, not able to get any work at all to do. One thing, too, I should like to refer to, and that is this. Reference has been made to a man of the name of Corin, who happens to be a member of my own trades union, and is a practical harness maker. He will be called before your Lordships; but he has been termed a sweater. He occupied that position, but his mind has so revolted at it that he has given up the practice.

4729. Will you confine yourself to your own evidence?
With regard to Walsall work, I would say that the Walsall work is not so well done; it cannot be so well done, work which I have pointed out to your Lordships; it is impossible for young girls and women to do.

4730. When you say that these men are out of work for four months in the year, do you mean that accoutrement makers cannot do any other kind of work, the work is so peculiar in itself?
In the case of the majority that is so.

4731. They could not work in the ordinary saddlery business?
No.

4732. Since when did this system of sub-contracting begin in your trade?
Since the Crimean war. At the time of the Crimean war the actual saddler used to have a good deal of the army contracts; then that insured good workmen working on it. The saddle and harness maker, who is entirely distinct from the accoutrement maker, used to do a considerable amount of the accoutrement work.

4733. Then this sub-contracting has existed during the whole of your experience in the trade?
Yes.

4734. Have you any idea through how many hands these contracts pass; whether they pass through the hands of more than one sub-contractor. If the Government put out an order to a contractor, according to you he would put it out to a sub-contractor?
Yes.

4735. And does that sub-contractor ever put it out again to a second sub-contractor?
Yes.

4736. How many hands would it pass through?
I know one instance. I am not prepared to prove it at the present time, where a firm was bankrupt that used to execute Government orders; they did not tender; another firm tendered and got an order and gave it to the bankrupt; the bankrupt again gave it to the sweater to get the manual labour done.

4737. That would be merely one firm substituting itself for the other one?
Yes.

4738. As I understand you, there are generally two contractors; there is the contractor who takes the order from the Government, and he sub-lets it to a sweater?
Yes.

4739. Does the latter generally do the work on his own premises, or does he put it out to workmen?
In some instances the sweater has it done on his premises, but in the majority of instances the men do it at their own homes.

4740. And what you complain of is that this system of sub-contracting takes away the fair profit that the workmen ought to earn?
Yes.

4741. Can you speak at all as to the Government prices that are paid?
No. I have seen a copy, but I am not prepared to produce it myself.

4742. You cannot say whether they vary with respect to the price of leather?
No, leather does not vary to that great extent. The only time that we find leather go up to any extent is when there is a great demand for it, as in the time of a war scare going on; then there will be a big order given for hides that will cause a run on the market.

4743. Do you mean that the price of leather is not less now than it was say five years ago, in general?
Not in general.

4744. Your association is a society of working men?
Yes.

4745. Can you give us the number in the association?
Four hundred and seventy-five; I think that is the correct number.

4746. Is that all over the country?
No, London alone. There is another organization in the provinces that has a matter of, I think, 27 branches; that numbers over 800 men.

4747. Earl of *Onslow*.] You say that the Government orders are irregular in quantity; sometimes there is a great press and sometimes it is very slack?
That is so.

4748. Do you attribute that to any particular causes?
In time of war there is a great demand for accoutrements and the fitting out of regiments with fresh articles. It may come all at once upon the market, at other times it may be spread over periods.

4749. That arises from circumstances over which the War Office would not have any control?
That may be so.

4750. Do you know anything of this factory of Messrs. Leckie's?
I have seen it.

4751. Have you any ground of complaint against the system of manufacturing in the factory?
Not in the least; on the contrary.

4752. Earl of *Derby*.] I suppose this business to which you refer is necessarily of a fluctuating character, because it depends upon peace or war?
Just so.

4753. And I suppose it follows as a consequence from that, that the demand for labour is very irregular, and that at times there is a good deal of labour that cannot be employed?
That is so.

4754. That arises from the conditions of the trade, and not from any cause that can be controlled?
Quite so.

4755. You said something about the workers being taxed by the sweater at every turn, and being made to pay for money advances, as I understood it; how is that; under what circumstances?

In

In this case. It is usual among the accoutrement makers, on account of the scanty wage which they receive, to run short perhaps the first, second, or third day in the week; if they have done a little work for this sweater and ask him for an advance, he will charge them a halfpenny on a shilling, even so late as Saturday morning.

4756. Is that done on such a scale as to amount to any considerable deduction from their earnings?
They do not earn a great deal. There are men in the room who have been mulcted in that way, who will be better able to explain.

4757. Lord *Clinton.*] What is the object of your Trades Union?
To advance the position of the workers in the trade.

4758. I think you said that you have had 475 members in London?
Yes.

4759. What effect has it had upon the rate of wages?
The accoutrement work brings into the saddle and harness trade a quantity of stitchers. In the saddle and harness-makers' trade we try (if I might be be allowed to say so, we are a superior trade to the accoutrement makers) to make every workman a competent workman, a preparer and a finisher. I regret to say that we have sweaters amongst the saddle and harness makers.

4760. Has your association had any effect upon wages in the trade?
Yes.

4761. Why do not these persons join your association, so that they might have some hope of getting increased wages by it?
I do not think that my society would accept accoutrement makers into it.

4762. But in your harness-making trade you say it has had an effect in keeping up wages?
Yes.

4763. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] What is the position of the sweaters in this trade. You say that they employ, on an average, about 10 men a piece, that there are about 20 sweaters employing 200 people; do the sweaters do any work themselves, except give out the work to the men who take it home?
They what we term prepare and finish it; that is, they would get leather out in strips. That (*pointing*) is made in four strips of leather, and when they get it out in strips they would have to point it, mark it, and prick it, and put it together, and then it would be given to the poor beings that are sweated, for them to put the stitches in; it would go back to the sweater to finish off, to pare back the edges or rub off the edges.

4764. That he does himself?
He himself, or he employs others to do it.

4765. But as a rule, is he a working man himself?
With the exception of the two that have been mentioned to your Lordships, I believe the others are practical men.

4766. Lord *Monkswell.*] Do you know anything of the rejection or acceptance of work done for the Government?
Only from the inquiry of the Judge Advocate General.

4767. You know nothing of your own personal knowledge?
Not anything.

4768. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] Does this strong thread involve harder work than the inferior thread?
Yes.

4769. And do the girls who work at the harness stitching, work in the factories or at their own homes?
Some at their own homes, some in the factories.

4770. Is it mostly at Walsall that the girls are employed on this work?
On the army work, yes; but it is getting more popular in London now. Ross is, or was, bringing women into his factory to supersede men's labour.

4771. In accoutrement work?
Yes.

4772. But then, if your society does not admit, or at any rate demurs to the admission of, the accoutrement workers, how is it you have, apparently, so much to do with that class of work?
Because some of our members in time of slackness in my own trade have to fall back upon the accoutrement work, and we naturally like to see them getting something like the pay that they are receiving in their own trade.

4773. The same pay as they would have got if they had been at a superior class of work?
Yes.

4774. Is it reasonable to expect that they should get the same when they are doing what you consider an inferior class of work, as when they are doing what you consider a superior class?
This inferior class of work is caused by the sweater doing the superior class of work himself, and keeping the accoutrement makers to the inferior, that is the stitching, alone.

4775. You mentioned that steps were taken to make each man who applied for admission to your society a competent worker; what steps are taken for that purpose?
When a man comes into a shop in my own trade, we help him as much as we can to get his own work ready, and to finish it off. I will tell you the reason that we do so. We hold that a competent workman is a much safer man in a trade than a bad and incompetent one; and a great many men are kept back by the desire of some men to do the easy and the light work, and let the others do the drudgery.

4776. *Chairman.*] What do you mean by a "safer man"?
He would not compete against his fellow workman by underselling him as an inferior man, and one afraid to ask a reasonable wage.

4777. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] Is the combination among the men in your trade in both departments greater or less, at present, than in former years?
Greater.

4778. In regard to the girls who work, do they, as far as you know, work in the same rooms as the men, or in separate rooms?
Some of them work in the same rooms as the men, others in rooms for women alone.

4779. Are you speaking of factories in both cases?
Yes. In London, in the saddle and harness trade, there are very very few women working; the London trade will not have women workers.

4780. But you mentioned that in some factories it is increasing?
Yes, in Walsall, and in accoutrement-making in Bermondsey.

4781. But I am including that in my question. In such cases do they work in the same rooms, in Bermondsey, for instance?
I am not prepared to say.

4782. Do you think it is a desirable thing that they should work in the same room?
I do not.

4783. Lord *Sandhurst.*] One question about your union. You say you only have 475 members of it?
Yes.

4784. Why is it not more numerously joined?

We

We spread all over London. There are not more than 900 men working in the saddle and harness making trades.

4785. They are not deterred from joining by the fear of not being employed if they join the union?
No; it is generally a recommendation to them. The best shops in London apply to the society to send them men.

4786. *Chairman.*] Do you know if the accoutrement makers have got an association of their own?
They started one a little over two years ago, but they were too poor to maintain their contribution.

4787. As I understand, your society does not admit accoutrement makers; but members of your society occasionally work at that branch of the trade?
That is so. If an accoutrement maker could establish to the satisfaction of the meeting that he was a competent workman, and capable of earning our minimum wage as prescribed by our society, then we should not object to his membership.

4788. How are the workmen paid in your trade, by piece work, or how do they work?
In a good many instances by piece work; in the majority of instances by day work. I am speaking of London.

4789. Have you got a statement of prices?
Yes.

4790. How was that fixed?
It was fixed by meetings of the men, and was then submitted to the employers, and it is in vogue in the principal West End shops. The West End shops are considered the best shops in our trade.

4791. How is that statement of prices fixed; is it for an indefinite period, or is it open to revision occasionally at regular periods, or how do you manage it?
It was formed in 1874; it has not been altered since.

4792. And those prices rule in your association?
Yes, in the shops where the best class of work is being done.

4793. Earl of *Onslow.*] What is the minimum wage of which you just now spoke?
Twenty-eight shillings per week.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

BERNARD DUNN, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

4794. *Chairman.*] What is your business?
I am a saddle and harness maker, employed by the Government at Woolwich.

4795. Have you any statement you wish to lay before the Committee?
Yes. In 1885 and 1886 I was employed in inspecting accoutrements supplied by the contractors for the Government.

4796. Is that what is commonly called a "viewer"?
Yes, a viewer. During that time I had occasion to reject a large number of articles; they were principally supplied by Ross & Company of Bermondsey. They were badly made; the stitching was defective; the thread was bad; it was not waxed. In rejecting the articles we always had to state the reason why we rejected them. I knew the articles were made on the sweating system.

4797. How did you know that?

All articles tendered by the contractor are stamped with his name, otherwise they are subject to be rejected. The articles were stamped "A. Ross & Company, Bermondsey, Contractor and Maker." The sub-contractor's name, or the initial of his name rather, was also stamped on the article, showing who the sub-contractor was. The largest amount of the articles were marked "H.;" that is a sweater named "Harold." Some of the others were marked "S.," meaning Squires; he is another sweater at Bermondsey, principally employed by Ross & Co.

4798. How do you know that these initials represents these names?
I was told so; but not only that, but the sweaters acknowledged it to the Government officials at Woolwich; they attended there when fault was found with the articles; they came there to see the inspector of accoutrements about them.

4799. You mean that when fault was found with the articles the sweater came forward to explain the matter?
Just so. If he was making them he was called; whichever sweater made the article, if fault was found, he came down and saw the inspector of accoutrements about it. I and several other viewers drew the attention of the inspector of accoutrements to the fact that things were badly made. He would remark that the men did not get much for doing so.

4800. Did not get so much for making them, you mean?
For making them. However, that had nothing to do with us; our duty was to reject them, which we did in very large quantities. I drew the attention of the authorities at Woolwich to the fact that articles were passed into the service that ought not to be.

4801. Whom do you mean by "the authorities"?
The Commissary General. He allowed me to select some of the articles and to point out the defects in them, which I did. A committee was appointed, presided over by Colonel Barrington, to inquire into the matter. I pointed out the defects, and Colonel Barrington took it down in writing. The inspector of accoutrements was called upon to state whether they were good or bad.

4802. When did this take place?
In January 1886. He said that there was nothing the matter with the accoutrements. That inspector was formerly an employé of Ross & Co., and was appointed direct from that firm to be a Government inspector. Through the report that he made the Commissary General reported to the War Office that I had made a frivolous complaint. Owing to that I sent a statement to the Secretary of State for War. My statement was sent to the Royal Commission on Warlike Stores, and I was called upon and gave evidence before the Royal Commission on the 23rd of February 1886. On account of the information which I gave the Royal Commission they attended at Woolwich on the following day, and asked me to point out the defective material to them I and another witness named Moody did so. Through what we brought to their notice they recommended that there should be full and searching inquiry conducted by some person or body of persons, independent of the Ordnance Department.

4803. Is it your contention that these inferior articles were made by sub-contractors?
Yes; all the work that came in there, or the greatest part of it, was made by sub-contractors on the sweating system.

4804. I understand you to say, in fact, that the work which was sent in by their sub-contractors was of an inferior quality?
Very much so.

4805. Are you still acting as a viewer?
No; I am still in the department as a saddler. I was a temporary viewer; and through my rejecting so many articles the inspector of accoutrements, when there was a vacancy for permanent viewers, brought in men direct from the firm of Ross & Co., men that had been working for the sweaters.

4806. What

4806. That has nothing to do with the inquiry before the Committee?
I want to show that the Government suffer through the sweating system in having bad articles passed into the service.

4807. You have already stated that in your opinion, from your experience as a viewer, the articles sent in by these sub-contractors are inferior?
Yes.

4808. Have you anything more to say on that point?
Through this inquiry that took place by the Judge Advocate General, independent experts were brought in to give their opinion on the articles that I selected.

4809. You have given us your opinion that the inferior work is done by sub-contractors; if you have anything further to add on that point in proof of what you have said, the Committee would be glad to hear it?
The Judge Advocate General and the experts called in decided that the articles were bad. I said that they were bad because they were made on the sweating system, that the men did not receive sufficient pay, that at the starvation price they had received they could not make the articles sufficiently good to be passed into the service.

4810. How long did you occupy the position of viewer?
Twelve months.

4811. Did a great number of articles pass through your hands?
A great number, thousands.

4812. Some made by the contractor direct, and some made by the sub-contractors?
The great number were made by sub-contractors. In 1885 and 1886 there were very large orders, and the sub-contractors in fact were working day and night.

4813. And your contention is that this sub-contracting, by cutting down the remuneration of the men, leads them to use an inferior quality of thread and so on, and not to turn out the work well?
Yes, the work is very inferior; in fact some of the stitches were never waxed, and were never pulled in. I have seen infantry waist belts joined with two or three stitches without any wax on, and I have taken them and just pulled them to pieces.

4814. And, therefore, you say that although the Government pay a good price they do not get a proper article?
But it is their own fault if they do not get the price; they tender their price.

4815. How do you mean?
If they want a contract they send in a tender. If there is a contract to be given out, there is a letter sent round to the different contractors, whose names are on the list, to tender for it, and they send in a price. I have seen water-bottles come in from Leckie's, and I could take every one of them with my finger and pull them to pieces; they were made by women; one or two stitches in the loops, and in the parts that go round the bottom.

4816. Do you mean to say that water-bottlers were also made by sub-contractors?
Yes; but even as regards the articles that were made on Ross' premises at the price he paid to the workers, it was impossible for them to do justice to the work.

4817. Earl of *Onslow.*] When you were examined before the Judge Advocate General's Committee, did you give any evidence there to prove that one of the reasons why these things were, in your opinion, defective, was because they were put out to contract and sub-contracted?
I told him that the price paid for them was not sufficient.

4818. But that is not my question. What I asked you was, did you, in giving evidence before that Committee, allege that one of the reasons why this work was bad was because it was done by contract and sub-contract, and not directly in a Government factory or otherwise?
No.

4819. Had you always been a viewer until recently, when you were dismissed?
I was never dismissed; I was a temporary viewer; I was taken on during the press of work; I was in the department, and I am still in the department.

4820. Have you ever been in the army?
Yes.

4821. In what position were you there?
The 9th Lancers.

4822. As a saddler?
Yes.

4823. Serjeant saddler?
I was a serjeant saddler.

4824. Were you during the whole time you were in the Lancers a serjeant saddler?
No, not all the time.

4825. What were you then when you left?
I was a private.

4826. Was there any reason for your being reduced to the ranks?
I did not think so. I appealed for a district court martial, but my appeal never went forward.

4827. We heard from Mr. Arnold White, at whose request, I believe, you have come here, that he was specially careful as to the character of the witnesses he proposed to call before us, and therefore I ask you whether you were not reduced to the ranks by court martial, and I ask you for what reason; what was the offence alleged against you?
The offence alleged against me was not complying with an order given to me by my commanding officer, and telling a falsehood.

4828. Earl of *Derby*.] Since that time you have been employed as a viewer?
Yes.

4829. Who appoints the viewers?
The superintendent of inspection now, formerly the Commissary General.

4830. And he, I suppose, was aware of your history when he appointed you?
Yes.

4831. Lord *Thring*.] Are you still in the army?
No, I left it: when I left the army in 1882 I went to Woolwich, and am there still.

4832. Earl of *Onslow*.] Were you correct in your answer to Lord Derby that you have been from that time to now a viewer?
I did not say from that time to now.

4833. For how long were you a temporary viewer?
Twelve months, from April 1885 to May 1886.

4834. *Chairman*.] In what capacity are you employed now?
The same as I was then; I was employed and on the rolls as a saddler and harness maker, but doing viewer's work.

4835. You are not doing any viewer's work now?
No.

4836. Lord *Clinton*.] You say that the goods are marked in the contractor's name?
Yes.

4837. And

4837. And if done by a sub-contractor, with the initials of the sub-contractor?
Yes.

4838. Therefore, the system is well known to the Government officials?
Yes.

4839. Has any objection ever been made to that contract system by the officials?
I have never known any made to it.

4840. All the Government officials require is that things shall be well made; they do not mind where or how they are made?
Just so.

4841. Earl of *Limerick.*] In Government contracts affecting accoutrements, is there any provision against sub-contracts?
I have never heard of it.

4842. Any provision obliging the contractor to make the goods all on his own premises?
I have never heard of it.

4843. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Do all the goods have the two marks, the mark of the name of the man who takes the contract, and, either another private mark of his own, or that of the sub-contractor; in other words are there some of the goods that are made by the contractors themselves and which have nothing but the contractor's mark on?
Yes, that is so.

4844. Have they any mark showing the factory in which they are made?
They have the contractor's stamp on.

4845. That is all?
That is all, if they are made on his premises.

4846. If they are made by a sub-contractor they have an "S," or whatever it is, which designates the sub-contractor?
Yes.

4847. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] Some questions were put with regard to your personal history; I want to know when you ceased to be a temporary viewer; had you any certificate of character from the inspector of the department?
It was not necessary. I should just like to make an explanation, as that might reflect on my character. At the time that I was tried and I appealed against it, I was acquitted on the first charge, and on the second charge I had two independent witnesses.

4848. Lord *Thring.*] What was the second charge?
Telling a falsehood.

4849. And the first?
Not complying with an order given me by the riding master.

4850. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] And you were acquitted on that?
I was acquitted on that. I appealed against the other, because I had no interest whatever in telling a falsehood. The riding master stated that he asked me why I did not repair a ball that was used by the officers in the riding school, and I told him that I had not time. The fact was that he had never asked me a question about it, and I merely told the commanding officer that he had not asked me about it. Had he asked me that certainly would have been my excuse, and it would have been a true one. I wish to state also that I left the 9th Lancers with an excellent character, which I have not here, but I showed it to the Judge Advocate General, on the inquiry.

4851. The official who appointed you as a temporary viewer, I presume, was aware of these facts, and therefore considered that there was nothing against your character to prevent your doing that work?
I suppose so.

4852. *Chairman.*] When you were examined before the Judge Advocate General's Committee, why did you not attribute the inferior workmanship of these goods to the fact that they were sub-contracted?
I thought it was well-known that they were sub-contracted.

4853. All that you gave evidence about then was as to the inferior quality of the goods, I presume?
Yes.

4854. And now you wish to attribute that inferiority, as, in your opinion, due to the fact that these articles are manufactured under this system of sub-contracting?
There is no doubt that that tends to have the things badly done.

4855. Do you know at all how the work is put out by the contractors to these various sub-contractors, or sweaters, as they are called?
Only what I have heard; I have never had anything to do with it.

4856. You have no personal knowledge; do you know whether the orders are put up to auction, or how they are tendered for by the sub-contractors?
No.

4857. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] As I understand you, your opinion was the same as to the sweaters, when you were examined before that former Committee, as it is now, though you were not asked about it on that occasion?
I was not asked. I certainly should have said so if I had been asked. I have here some of the prices paid by the Government to the contractors.

4858. *Chairman.*] Do you know the prices at which the contractors put them out to sub-contractors?
There are men here who can speak as to that; I cannot speak to that.

4859. You may read out the prices?
These are the prices.

HARNESS.

	£.	s.	d.
Tugs (Royal Artillery)	–	4	–
Tugs (Army Service Corps)	–	6	10
Traces, rope, lead, per pair	1	6	6
Traces, rope, wheel, per pair	1	4	6
Reins, driving, per pair	–	9	–
Reins, bridoon, per pair	–	1	4
Breechings, near, complete with strap	1	5	3
Breechings, off, complete with strap	1	5	3
Bridles, complete, consisting of Portsmouth bit, with head rein, curb chain, and hook	–	5	6
Girth, leather	–	3	8
Horseshoe cases (harness)	–	4	–
Horseshoe cases (saddlery)	–	2	7
Cruppers (harness)	–	2	9
Cruppers (saddlery)	–	2	7
Head collar, with brow band and throat lash, complete	–	4	3
Bearing reins, in two parts	–	1	9
Leading reins, in two pieces	–	1	8
Side reins	–	1	–
Back bands and belly bands:			
Army Service Corps	–	8	4
Royal Artillery	–	15	–

ACCOUTREMENTS.

	£.	s.	d.
Ball, bags, leather, black rifle	–	1	5½
Ball, bags, buff, Infantry	–	2	4
Bags (ammunition) black enamelled, Royal Artillery	–	2	3½
Bags, ammunition, black rifle	–	2	1
Belts, leather (black) japanned, Staff Sergeants'	–	4	–
Belts, leather, Sergeants'	–	2	3
Belt, leather, Rank and File	–	2	2
Belts, brown, Staff Sergeants' and Army Hospital Corps	–	4	6
Belts, buff, Sergeants, Royal Engineer and Infantry Sergeants	–	2	5
Belts, buff, Rank and File	–	2	3
Belts, buff, Lancers, 2¼ inches wide, Sergeants and Rank and File	–	2	5
Belts, buff, Artillery and Rank and File	–	2	2
Frogs, brown (Army Service Corps)	–	–	10½
Frogs, brown, Sea Service	–	–	6
Frogs, buff, Army Hospital Corps	–	1	2
Frogs, buff, Infantry (Sergeants)	–	1	2
Frogs, buff, Rank and File	–	1	2
Pouches, leather, ammunition, black japanned, Cavalry, 20 rounds, Sergeants and Rank and File	–	3	1
Pouches, black, Infantry, Sergeants, 20 rounds	–	2	2
Pouches, black, Royal Artillery (Sergeants)	–	4	–
Pouches, black, Royal Artillery, Rank and File	–	3	10

4860. Those are the prices paid by the Government?
Yes, that is taken from the Government vocabulary.

4861. When were those prices paid?
That is extant now.

4862. Earl of *Onslow.*] Have you not expressed a grievance against the Government officials in that after having been a temporary viewer during the press of business in the year 1885, when a vacancy occurred amongst the permanent viewers you were passed over?
I have.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

JOHN CORIN, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined as follows:

4863. *Chairman.* WHAT is your trade?
Harness maker.

4864. What point do you wish to give evidence upon?
I wish to correct a little mistake that happened at the beginning; a statement that Mr. White made against me, as being one of the principal sweaters of Messrs. Ross and Company. I was not one of the principal sweaters. I had to work after sweaters, though I really was a sweater. These sweaters, or the principal sweaters, are Mr. Harold and Mr. Squires If there is an order out, for instance, a mule order——

4865. What do you mean by a sweater, a sub-contractor?
A sub-contractor, the one that puts in the tender to the contractor. For instance, I will say there is an order for mule harness. They send these men down, Harold and Squires, to put a price on these articles. They put a price on, and it is sent in to the firm. When it is sent in to the firm, the head of the firm takes note which has the lowest prices, and the consequence is, whichever puts in the lowest, so it is sent out. If they cannot do the quantity as they wish, these other men must take it, such as myself. And that is how the orders are tended for by the sub-contractors, as your Lordship asked just now.

4866. As I understand you, you say that the Government contractor asks for tenders from the sub-contractor?
Yes.

4867. Gives the work out to the man who offers the lowest tender?
Yes.

4868. And then if he cannot do it all, other and smaller men get the balance of the work to do?
Yes, they can have the leavings.

4869. Do they get it at the same price?
They get it at the same price, but the price is really what is contracted for by the contractor; it is such a very low price that the sub-contractor does not care about doing it, and the smaller people can come in then and take it, like myself.

4870. In that case, what profit does the sub-contractor make of it?
Not any; he will take it off the firm; every man then takes it from the firm by whom they are employed.

4871. Do you mean to say that a sub-contractor makes a very low tender, and having got that tender accepted, doos not execute that contract, all of it?
No, not all of it.

4872. He takes the best of it for himself?
Yes, takes the best of it for himself, and lets the other people do the best they can; that is Mr. Harold and Mr. Squires.

4873. Are you still working in the same business?
No, I am working in a harness-maker's shop at present.

4874. When did you leave this business?
A week before Easter.

4875. How many men did you employ when you were on it?
Sometimes I had two, three, four, and five and six; it all depends on how much work I had. For instance, I will quote to you the prices.

4876. Did you hear the list of Government prices that was read out by the last witness?
I did.

4877. Can you give us the prices that the sub-contractor received for the same article?
Some of them are here; the sea service 20-round pouch was given out in 1885, at 4¼ *d.*, I paid 3¼ *d.*; that was a penny for preparing and taking in and out; in 1886 they paid 4 *d.*

4878. Who do you mean by they?
Alexander Ross and Company.

4879. You mean the contractors?
The contractors; they paid 4 *d.*, I paid 3¼ *d.*; then on the 30-round pouch which were given out at 5 *d.*, I paid 4¼ *d.* for stitching.

4880. I do not clearly understand now what you mean when you say they were "given out"?
That is out from the contractor's firm, given to the sub-contractors.

4881. And then you say "I gave"; to whom did you give?
I gave to the men that stitched them for me, 4¼ *d.* out of the 5 *d.*; that left me ¾ *d.* There is another pouch given out by them of 36-rounds, but that was so bad a price that I could not take them out.

4882. Have you any idea how that order was executed?
Yes, I believe a man named Taylor did all the 36-rounds, the work inside.

4883. The price was not good enough for you to do it, but somebody else did it?

They

They did. In 1885 buff pouches were paid 5 *d.* for; I paid 3½ *d.* for stitching. In 1887 they were paid 4 *d.* for; I paid 3 *d.* for stitching. At the present time, and for some months past, Alexander Ross & Company have determined to do away with the sweaters, as they termed them; and they undertook to employ a lot of girls inside, and instead of paying them the same price as the sweater did outside, 3 *d.*, they only paid them 2 *d.*; so that it does not altogether lie with an out-door man where the sweating comes in. There is a black pouch, the same sort of pouch that was paid 6 ½*d.* for in 1885; in 1886 they lowered them to 4½ *d.*, which, at the time they were 6½ *d.*, I paid 5 *d.* for sewing; at the time they were 4½ *d.* I paid 3¼ *d.* for sewing; sea service waist belts, 3¾ *d.*; and I paid 2 *s.* 9 *d.* a dozen, 2¾ *d.* each. The shaft tugs were paid in 1886, 8 *d.*, and I paid 6 *d.* for sewing; that left 2 *d.* for finishing off, which I did, a few; but I could not take any more, as they were such a disgraceful price. Head collars, as a foreman informed me, he received some 1 *s.* 4 *d.* each for them; at the present time they are 9 *d.*, with 2 *d.* extra work in them, and they try to get them done at 8 *d.* This is Alexander Ross & Company I am speaking of only. Artillery cruppers were paid 6 *d.* for out of the firm, and I paid 4½ *d.* for stitching, a disgraceful price. Gun slings, I received 1 *d.* each for them; I paid 5 *s.* a hundred; that was in 1885. In 1887 they lowered them to a halfpenny; I paid 4¼ *d.* a dozen for them; that left me 1¾ *d.* a dozen for preparing and sewing them up, and taking them in and out, and standing all responsibility for rejections. Shoe pockets were paid 6½ *d.* for; I paid 5 *d.* for sewing them; that left me 1 ½*d.* for preparing and finishing. That was in 1885. In 1887 they paid 6 *d.* for them, and I could not get them ready under 1½ *d.*, so I was obliged to pay 4½ *d.*; still, at the same time as I was paying 5 *d.* there was not more than one man in Bermondsey who paid more than 4½ *d.* That was the time that they were 6½ *d.* out. There were several instances where I paid more, or else I should not perhaps have come here. Saddle girths I think Mr. Dunn spoke of just now; they paid 4½ *d.* out of the firm for them; I paid 3 *s.* for stitching a dozen; that is, they paid 4 *s.* 6 *d.* a dozen; I paid 3 *s.* a dozen for stitching, where other men round, Potten, Squires, Harold, and all, I think, in Bermondsey at that time, were paying 2 *s.* 6 *d.* Saddle seats were paid by Ross's firm, within 10 years ago, universal, 1 *s.* 1 *d.*; at the present time they are paid 8 *d.*, with 2 *d.* more work in them. Artillery drivers' seats were 1 *s.* 2 *d.*; at the present time, 9 *d.*

4884. You told us how the principal sub-contractors get their orders from the contractors, by tendering for them; how is the work put out to the smaller men just like yourself; have you to make tenders?

I go to the firm.

4885. Do you mean the sub-contractor?

The foreman of the department of the contractors; I go into the contractor's firm, and he has a lot of articles there; he says, "These are so much;" or at times he does not know the price, or will not know the price; you have to go in there, and if you want work you must take work not knowing the price of it, and in consequence when Saturday comes they can pay you what price they like.

4886. I thought you said just now that two or three large sub-contractors get the orders, and put out some of it to smaller men?

They have in some instances done that, but as I was placed, I went to the firm and got mine.

4887. What part of the work did you do yourself?

I did the preparing and finishing.

4888. In your opinion is it the case that this sub-contracting system leads to putting in inferior thread and not stitching the article properly?

Yes; and my opinion is that the contractors themselves are much more to blame than the men that are outside, because they are next to starving; it is a starvation life, for there is hardly one that has been employed at Alexander

Ross & Company's at the present time I think I am the only one, I may mention, left out of debt.

4889. You are now working where?
In St. Andrew's-street; Mr. Flegg's.

4890. You are now working in a factory?
Yes, I am working in a factory.

4891. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Did you put any mark on your work when you did it?
I did; "C."

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

JABEZ SMITH, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined as follows:

4892. *Chairman.*] WHAT is your business?
I am a practical harness maker by trade.

4893. Are you not working at that trade now?
I have been in the accoutrement line lately, but I am not in any trade at present; I am not doing anything at present, that is.

4894. What point do you wish to speak to the Committee about?
On the journey work, on the sewing. I worked for Potten principally on valises. In 1885 complete they were 11 *s.* 9 *d.* a dozen; in 1886 they were 9 *s.* 3 *d.* and lower; but in 1887 and in 1888 they were 7 s. 10 *d.*

4895. Were these goods supplied to the Government?
Yes, some of them were, Mr. Briggs' contract, and some were Ross' contract. In the harness line I have done the bak ba nds and the tugs, girths, leather girths, stirrup leathers and head collars.

4896. What have you to say about that?
The prices in 1886 on head collars were 6¼ *d.*; 6 *s.* 3 *d.* a dozen.

4897. By prices what do you mean?
The price that we were paid; the stitchers' money, 6¼ *d.* each. Then breast collars were 4½ *d.*; girths were 2½ *d.*, leather girths; surcingles were 1 *d.*

4898. What this comes to is that you formerly could earn more money and have better wages than you do now?
Yes.

4899. Do you have to find your own thread and wax?
Yes, and we have to stand the breakages of awls; we break many awls in the shaft tugs.

4900. Is it in your opinion true that inferior thread is used?
Yes, I know it is in cases; in fact I have used a smaller thread myself sometimes; I have known cases where the shaft tugs, instead of being some six-cord, as our orders were, to be four-cord outside row, and three-cord inside row.

4901. To what do you attribute this fall in wages?
To the more profit to the second man, the middle-man; if he takes it off us it must go into his pocket.

4902. How are they able to do that more now than they could years ago?
Simply because they can bring so many more hands into it, and simply inexperienced hands are brought into it, and are taught; women principally.

4903. And you would attribute that fall in your wages to the introduction of women labour?
Yes.

4904. Earl

4904. Earl of *Onslow.*] Have you any remedy to propose for that state of things?
As regards the contractors it should be done on the firms; in the contractors' firms.

4905. *Chairman.*] You mean that the Government orders ought to be executed by the contractor himself?
Yes.

4906. Earl of *Onslow.*] Do you think that if that condition were insisted upon the London contractor would still continue to tender and be accepted?
There would not be the competition for the prices below them between the workers and the contractors; but I should think myself that if the contracts for material were taken into the Arsenal, or into a place by the Government, and the work given out from the Government to agents at a fixed price for the workers, and a commission to the agents, sweating would be impossible,

4907. Do I understand you to mean that the agents should bind themselves not to give less than a minimum wage?
Yes; the workers' wage fixed.

4908. You would recommend then, that in all Government contracts there should be a clause that the workmen should not be paid less than a certain sum?
Yes.

4909. *Chairman.*] And how would you calculate that; upon the cost of the article?
Upon the labour there was in the article, and the time it took to make it.

4910. Earl of *Derby.*] You are speaking only of Government work, I presume, when you attempt to fix the minimum payment for labour?
That is all.

4911. Do you think that would be easily enforced?
If the Government took it in hand I should think it would be easily enforced.

4612. Would there not be a strong temptation to any one employed under the Government to keep back some part of the pay if men were willing to take a lower rate?
Well, but if a schedule was bound to be posted in every workshop, the workman could do no other but see his price.

4913. We may assume, may we not, that there would be a considerable competition to get into a shop where this minimum wage was fixed?
No, there would be no competition, simply because the price would be fixed for that work, so that there would be no competition for a lower price amongst the sweaters; there would be no sweaters then.

4914. Would there not be competition among the men to get into that employment?
If the Government appointed agents, with a commission, to pay at a certain rate, there would be no competition necessary.

4915. Are there not more men wanting such employment than are likely to get it?
Yes.

4916. You do not propose that Government should be bound to employ everybody who applies?
No.

4917. Then there would be a certain number of men wanting to get into this employment, and a certain number who would not get in?
Yes; they should get in without tendering for price, by qualification.

4918. But in some way or another they must be chosen; the agent, or subcontractor, or whatever you call him, would choose them; would there not be very

very strong inducement to them to offer him something, and to him to take something from them, for the privilege of getting this employment?

If the agent were employed by the Government officials to take the work out, and give it out to the workers at a certain fixed price, he could get no more than his commission; if he extorted it it would be laid open to be found out.

4919. Lord *Clinton.*] You would not allow the agent to pay the men?
Only the fixed price.

4920. The money should come from the Government?
From the Government, through the agent, to the men.

4921. Earl of *Onslow.*] Have you any idea what proportion of the whole of your trade is Government work?
A great proportion; all I have done has been Government work.

4922. But you do not know how much of the whole of the saddlery trade is Government work, and how much is work for the rest of the world?
No, I do not.

4923. Lord *Monkswell.*] Are you told that your work is rejected; do you know it?
I have very little rejected. We have it back to alter, so we know it.

4924. You say that on some occasions you used three or four-cord thread yourself instead of six-cord, for making a shaft tug; was that rejected or not?
I never had a shaft tug rejected.

4925. I suppose a viewer ought to be able to know whether it was three or four-cord or five or six; or would that be difficult?
He might, but it would be difficult to find it out; if the thread is loosely twisted it looks larger than it is.

4926. Then you would not necessarily say that it argues dishonesty on the part of the viewer to pass these?
No; unless he takes every article and examines it and cuts a piece of the thread out I do not see how it is to be found out.

4927. He ought to be able to tell if there were seven stitches to the inch?
Yes.

4928. Have you ever put in less?
In the valises I have put in two and a-half and they passed them, and even two and they have passed.

4929. What is the regulation?
Three.

4930. I suppose there could be no mistake about that; that could be very easily found out?
If they were overlooked it would.

4931. A viewer could find that out?
He could scarcely see much about the seaming, because the back is turned.

4932. In that case it might be simply negligence, not necessarily dishonesty?
Not necessarily dishonesty on the viewer's part, but dishonesty on the sub-contractor's part.

4933. But the viewer would not necessarily find out, unless he looked into the matter very closely, that anything was wrong?
He would have to look very closely to find that out.

4934. *Chairman.*] Your contention is that, owing to this cutting down of prices, the natural tendency of everybody is to scamp the work as much as they can without being found out?
Yes.

4935. And

4935. And that it is very difficult for Government officials to find it out?
Yes.

4936. In the saddlery trade in London, it is the case, is it not, that there is a statement of prices fixed between the workmen and masters?
In the society; but I am not a society member.

4937. What you suggest is, that something of the same kind should be done in the accoutrement trade by the Government?
Yes, fixed by the Government themselves.

4938. Is there any society in the accoutrement trade now?
Not now; there was about two years ago, though I did not belong to it; there was not sufficient work to keep it going.

4939. How is it that the workmen in the accoutrement trade do not combine?
It would be simply no use to combine?

4940. Why?
Because they could bring so many more hands into it. I have known the time when there has been a little brisker work, enough to keep us going; Potten has advertised for 500 hands.

4941. And did he get them?
He would get a tremendous lot to come, but he would set on three or four.

4942. Where do they come from?
All parts of London, and the country too; some have come from Birmingham at times.

4943. In fact, in your branch of the trade there is tremendous competition?
Yes, I have known us to be entirely out of work, standing still a week after an advertisement has been out; so that we are not very busy when the advertisement has been out.

4944. Lord *Sandhurst.*] You are out of work now?
Yes.

4945. Is that because there is no work to be got?
There is nothing much to be got, and it is a job, as a rule, to get into the harness line after you have been on the accoutrements.

4946. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Many harness men object to you?
Yes.

4947. Do you think it would be sufficient that the Government contract merely stated the price of labour, or do you think it would be necessary that the actual payment should be made by a Government official?
The payment I do not know about; but if a fixed wage was named I do not think they could get out of it.

4948. You mean, if the original contract was so much for the material, which was to be made up at a certain price for labour, if that appeared on the original contract that would be sufficient?
Yes; the contractor would not say he could do it for a certain price if he knew that the work was going to cost him a certain amount of it.

4949. *Chairman.*] You say that the saddlers object to employing men who have been working in the accoutrement trade?
A good many do.

4950. Why is that?
They think their hand is out, that they are not fit to go on light work, on the best harness. If you apply at the best shops and tell them that you have been on military accoutrement work, they will say, "You will not suit me at all"; they would consider your hand was out.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

12*th June* 1888.

WILLIAM HARCOMBE, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

4951. *Chairman.*] ARE you employed in the accoutrement trade?
Yes, ever since I have been born.

4952. Can you give the Committee any information as to the condition of the trade?
Yes, what it is now and what it was in 1875 and 1878.

4953. What have you got to say about it?
The prices are different now from what they were then.

4954. Have you heard the list of prices that has been read out by the other witnesses?
Yes.

4955. Do you agree with them?
Yes.

4956. If so, there is no occasion to go all over them again. Do you agree generally with what the last witness has said?
Yes, we were all alike.

4957. You have nothing particular to add to what he has said?
Only about Mr. Tomlin, at Ross and Company; I should like to tell you this: he contracts at Ross and Company. Two years ago there was a rare large order for the Red Sea Service, and we formed a society, and because we formed a society he tried to crush us, to put us in the union because we would not do his work at his price, and he sent it to Walsall and said he would get it cheaper done there; and he had a rare number of rejections for bad work.

4958. How do you know that?
I altered some of what was rejected at Woolwich.

4959. What became of that society which you formed?
We could not uphold it.

4960. Do you mean that you could not get men enough to join?
The work was so bad that we could not uphold it at all.

4961. How many members did it consist of?
When we first formed the society we got I should think about 50 or 60.

4962. Have you any idea how many men are working at your trade?
Some hundreds, and women and children.

4963. What work do the children do?
They do light accoutrements; buff frogs, coat straps, gun slings.

4964. And you could not uphold your society, I suppose, because there were so many men who did not join it?
Yes, we could not do anything.

4965. And do you mean to say that there were a great many rejections of this work that was done at Walsall?
Yes.

4966. Is there anything more on that point that you wish to say?
I wish to tell you about some frogs; the price they are paying for frogs now at the present time.

4967. But have we not had this already?
No. Buff frogs are paying 9 *d.* per dozen.

4968. When you say "paying," what do you mean?
The sweater is getting them out from Almond's; a man named William Davis,

Davis, he gets them out, and he gets the stitches put in for three-farthings each. Mess-tin straps 1 *s.* per hundred, and the gun-slings 1 *s.* 10 *d.* per hundred.

4969. Any more prices?
He is paying for four buckle girths, two loops, 4¼ *d.*; stirrup straps, 3 *d.* per dozen; artillery cruppers, 3½ *d.*

4970. Were these prices much better when you first remember the trade?
Yes.

4971. How do you account for the difference?
It is on account of the contractors.

4972. When you first knew the trade were there not sub-contractors?
They were much better then.

4973. Do you mean that they paid better prices?
They paid better prices then than they do now.

4974. Then you do not know how to account for that?
No, I do not.

4975. Earl of *Onslow.*] What are the average wages that you earn?
The average wages that I am earning now is about 15 *s.* a week, and not that sometimes.

4976. And do you earn that all the year round or only in parts of the year?
It is according how we get the work.

4977. But there is a slack time, I suppose, and a busy time?
When it has been slack I have got more money than that in past times.

4978. Your average is 15 *s.*?
The average that I used to take is 27 *s.* or 28 *s.*

4979. *Chairman.*] When you say "used to take," how long ago do you mean?
About four years ago.

4980. And now your average is about 15 *s.*?
Yes.

4981. Earl of *Derby.*] Did that fall in wage come all at once, or was it gradual?
It has been gradually going on for the last few years.

4982. And you were proceeding to explain the reason; will you proceed to do so?
I should like to know the reason that we should be sweated down.

4983. You mean that the sub-contracting system has been developed in the last few years, is that so?
Yes.

4984. Is that in consequence, do you think, of there being a greater competition than before, making it more difficult for the men to resist; or can you give any other reason?
I cannot explain it.

4985. *Chairman.*] Have women and children always been employed in the trade as long as you have known it?
Yes; there have been more this last four or five years by Mr. Tomlin getting them in to crush the men.

4986. But they always have been employed more or less?
Yes, ever since I have been in the trade.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

12*th June* 1888.

CHARLES COMPTON is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined as follows:

4987. *Chairman.*] HAVE you heard the evidence of the last three witnesses? Yes.

4988. Do you agree with it?
I quite agree with it.

4989. Have you any particular point you wish to mention to the Committee that has not been already mentioned?
There is one thing I would like to comment a little upon. I think myself this trade, what is called the harness and accoutrement trade, might be carried out the same as the cigar-making trade is carried out in France. All the cigar trade in France is done under the Government, and each workman when he has completed a week's work, receives a week's salary; and if such were done by the harness and accoutrement trade in England, it would prevent all sweating and the sweating system, and by that both Government and the workers would be benefited.

4990. How would you propose that the Government work should be done?
By superintendence under Government officials.

4991. You agree with a former witness that the Government ought to have agents who should get the work done by workmen, the Government to fix the rate of wages; is that what you mean?
Yes, that is what I mean.

4992. Then do not you think that there would be enormous competition to get into the Government employment?
There must be, truly.

4993. Would not that be an immense temptation to these agents or superintendents, to take premiums or money fines from the men?
Suppose we are debarred from that point of view and take it say, to the Clothing Department at Pimlico, and have it worked out in that manner, and have a systematic scale, that would prevent all bribery and corruption and all the sweating system.

4994 Perhaps you would explain that a little more fully?
I am not much of a classical scholar, but my plain and simple statement is, that the work should be carried out in a plain and systematic way, the same as the Clothing Department is carried out at the works at Chelsea.

4995. Do you understand how the Clothing Department is carried out. You say that you would be satisfied if the army accoutrement trade could be carried on in the same way as the Clothing Department is managed at Chelsea; I ask you whether you know how the Clothing Department at Chelsea is managed?
I really could not explain it, not as I should wish to.

4996. In fact, you have never been employed there?
No, I never was employed there.

4997. Lord *Clinton.*] Is there any sub-contracting there?
Not that I am aware of?

4998. *Chairman.*] What you mean is that the Clothing Department of Chelsea is managed in a certain way, and you think that the army accoutrement trade ought to be conducted in the same manner?
Quite so.

4999. Earl of *Onslow.*] What you mean is, is it not, that the Army clothing is carried on on Government premises and under Government superintendence, and you desire the army accoutrements to be carried on in the same way?
That is quite so.

5000. *Chairman.*] You would not have it put out at all?
They give it out from the Clothing Department to outside workers, as well as employ

employ people on the premises, but there is no sweating that ever I have seen or heard of. I have been associated with several of them; they give them a certain amount of work to do in one week.

5001. Are you in this army accoutrement trade?
Yes, I am an accoutrement maker.

5002. Are you working at it now?
Yes.

5003. And do you bear out what the other witnesses have said as to the fall in wages?
I quite agree with that.

5004. Lord *Monkswell.*] Your information is different from mine as to the Pimlico Clothing Department; because I am told that a great deal of sweating goes on with regard to Government contracts that are let out, that are done outside the factory?
Then I do not know it; I am ignorant of that.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. JULIUS ADOLPH DEINTJE, having been recalled; is further Examined as follows:

5005. *Chairman.*] I UNDERSTAND that you have made, through the Committee Clerk, an application to the Committee to be allowed to say something in reference to your former evidence, owing to something that occurred the other day?
Yes.

5006. I think that probably you are under some misapprehension in the matter, and that probably you think that some evidence was given before the Committee to the effect that you had been tampered with or influenced in some way. Now, the Committee have examined the evidence which was given the other day, and they have come to the conclusion that no evidence whatever of that kind has been given before the Committee, and under those circumstances, if that was your reason in making an application to be further heard, there can be no occasion for you, or necessity upon you, to go into any explanatory matter in connection with the circumstances?
I do not wish to occupy your Lordship's time only for a few minutes.

5007. I want you to understand that the Committee are of opinion that there is no necessity to call upon you to ask you to give any explanation now, because, having examined the evidence carefully, the Committee have come to the conclusion that no evidenc has been given before them in any way casting a slur upon your character, or to the effect that you have been influenced in any kind of way. Therefore the Committee see no reason to trouble you to give any explanation in the matter.
Would your Lordships allow me to continue on a future day my evidence which I commenced last Friday. I was stopped as soon as I commenced; I had got further evidence to give.

5008. But you had completed your evidence the other day?
No; as soon as I commenced Mr. Arnold White stopped me, and the evidence which I was going to give was exactly in accordance——

5009. You had better write to the Secretary of the Committee and say that you wish to give further evidence, and the Committee will consider the matter.
I will do so.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Veneris, 15° *Junii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of CANTERBURY.
Earl of DERBY.
Lord CLINTON.
Lord CLIFFORD OF CHUDLEIGH.
Lord FOXFORD (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord ROTHSCHILD.
Lord MONKSWELL.
Lord THRING.

LORD KENRY (EARL OF DUNRAVEN AND MOUNT-EARL), IN THE CHAIR.

MR. JULIUS ADOLPH DEINTJE, having been recalled; is further Examined as follows:

5010. *Chairman.*] I UNDERSTAND you wish to add something to the evidence you gave the other day?

Yes. I cannot agree with the greater part of what has been said against Messrs. Maple & Co. in respect of the sweating system. They, like other houses, offer less for the goods than the maker asks. When out, selling to the trade, I have experienced great difficulty in selling any article with even a small profit, as the majority of the buyers in the cabinet trade make a special practice of telling the maker that the wood of the article is so much, the glass so much, the brasswork so much, and the workmanship (which they do not understand) they put very little value upon.

5011. Do you mean that the buyer puts very little value upon the workmanship?

Yes, because he does not understand it, not being a practical man.

5012. You mean he does not put enough money value upon it?

If I stand before a buyer and ask him a price, say 20 *l.*, he says, "What! The wood costs you so much, the glass so much, the brass so much; you want all that money!" and the workmanship he puts very little value on, because in most cases he is not a practical man; he has been taken from a salesman, and that is the reason. This is an ordinary practice throughout the trade. Since last Friday I have referred to my books, but as I do not employ a clerk, and as my time is occupied in the superintending of my workmen, the books are not kept as they ought to be. I had done a good trade for many years with Messrs. Maple & Co., but I cannot give a statement of transactions for an earlier period than the year 1883, as my premises, 9 and 10, Charlotte Mews, were destroyed by fire, and I lost the whole of my property, and also my books. I find my first transaction with Messrs. Maple & Co., after the fire, was in February 1883, and amounts to 31 *l.* 5 *s.*; 5*s.* was deducted from that account, and also 2½ counting house discount. The following accounts succeeded: March, 14 *l.* 10*s.* and 20*l.*; May, 42 *l.*; June, 37 *l.*, 28*l.* 10 *s.*, and 17 *l.* 10 *s.*

5013. What are you going to prove from these figures?

The deductions; the knocking off, besides the discount; that is a very important point.

5014. Deductions made on account of bad workmanship?
Bad workmanship; exactly so.

5015. You went rather fully into that the other day, and you have already told the Committee that certain deductions which were made, in your opinion, were made because the articles were not as good as they ought to be?
In my case I have experienced that.

5016. You have already told the Committee that; you need not go into that again?
July, 17 *l.* 10 *s.*; only 2½ per cent. deducted. September, 18 *l.* 10 *s.*; 10 *s.* deducted and 2½ per cent. October, 65 *l.* 10 *s.*: 2½ per cent. counting-house deduction. November, 11 *l.* 10 *s.*; 10 *s.* deducted and 2¼ per cent.

5017. What were these deductions for?
They were made when they found fault; perhaps a door would not work easy, or a drawer would not work easy, or a lock would not act as it ought to do.

5018. You have already given us evidence on that point, and there is no occasion to repeat what you said the other day?
No, I do not wish to repeat it.

5019. You have already told us the other day that in your case these deductions were made on account of something faulty in the workmanship, and that, in your opinion, that was the reason why the deductions were made in other cases besides your own?
If your Lordship wishes I will not go on with that point.

5020. We have had quite sufficient on that point?
I have got an account here down to May 1884. Up to that time the makers were privileged to go through Messrs. Maple & Co.'s show rooms, or go into them, and they were not interfered with, and this, in my opinion, caused a serious injury to special designers, their designs being copied and reproduced at cutting and sweating prices. About May 1884 a notice was affixed to Messrs. Maples' show-room door, to the effect that no makers or tradesmen were to be admitted into the show room. I went into the show room, not perceiving the notice, and Mr. Robert Blundell (the nephew of Mr. Maple) in a very insulting manner ordered me out. I had some hot words with him, and walked off the premises. After that I did not do business with Messrs. Maple & Co. for six months. The first transaction I had after that with them was in November, for 56 *l.*, less 2½ per cent. This made the whole of my trade with the firm during the year 1884, amount to a total of 318 *l.* 15 *s.*, no deductions being made at all except counting-house discount.

5021. I do not think you need go into the extent of your business with Mr. Maple, unless you wish to make any particular point upon it?
The dispute with Mr. Robert Blundell caused a bitter feeling between us, and through his influence Mr. Maple grew bitter against me also.

5022. What do you wish to prove by this evidence. There are two special points that you gave evidence about the other day before the Committee; one on this question of discount, and the other as to the designs being copied. You have given us some more information on both those points; have you anything fresh to tell us?
Yes; I hope your Lordships will permit me to touch again upon an account or two, because I believe it is very important for what has hereafter to come.

5023. What do you want to prove by quoting from your accounts?
The end of the last accounts I did with Messrs. Maple & Co.

5024. What do you want to prove from them; what point do you want to make. If you could tell the Committee what it is that you want to prove or make out from the accounts, we will judge whether we can receive it?
In May of the year 1888, I again went to Messrs. Maple & Co. and saw the manager; I told him that I had a very nice five foot Chippendale cabinet, and that I wanted 28 *l.*; he told me if I would bring it round, if he liked it, he would buy it; I took it, and he bought it.

5025. What

5025. What has that got to do with the inquiry that we are making?
Well, my Lord, I will not proceed any further with it.

5026. I do not want to stop you on anything which is relevant to the inquiry?
I thought it would be very important; if your Lordships do not think so, I do not wish to say anything about it.

5027. We need not trouble you any further on that?
I have very important evidence to lay before your Lordships on other matters.

5028. What are the other matters?
In regard to the sweating system.

5029. Will you state it to us?
I worked at Messrs. Howard and Sons as journeyman about 13 or 14 years ago; I worked "lump" work, or what is ordinarily called piece-work. On very rare occasions I had my price given me before or when I started an article; generally the price was given after the commencing or completing the article. About every three or four weeks I would be able to see my book and see what prices had been given to me, and on some occasions I was obliged to see the manager when he had made a mistake and put down too low a price. I knew it was impossible for any foreman or manager to fix a price upon every original design till it had been made. I remember occasions when prices had been given to me before, and I have seen at once that a price was too high, and also *vice versâ*. Sweating in the cabinet trade is mostly practised at the East End of London; in Curtain-road I have sometimes been unable to get half the price of my cost. Such houses I compare to a slaughter-house, the slaughterer standing in front of these premises watching for his prey to come; and if your Lordships would only visit the neighbourhood on a Friday and a Saturday, you would be dismayed. In my opinion there is over-production; the warehouses have been filled on the speculation of the dealer, and as he has a heavy stock to fall back upon, he can afford to wait, unless he can buy the goods at his own price. I see no remedy for this state of things except by shortening the working hours; no employer to be permitted to employ a servant for more than 50 or 56 hours per week, and every shop to be registered. This, I believe, would do away with the man who takes the price of an article below its value, as he only reckons to get his profits out of his men's exertions. I know particular workshops where six men could be employed easily, but three men have to do the work. I have seen them work myself at 10, 11, and 12 o'clock at night, and also on Sundays; there are hundreds of workshops where this system is practised. There is always a certain variation and change from the monotony of the work. If the working hours are limited to nine hours a day, no hard work can be injurious to any man. Inspectors should be appointed in every parish, and changed from parish to parish every year or two years.

5030. What do you mean by "inspectors;" do you mean sanitary inspectors?
No; I mean factory inspectors for the workshops, to pay visits to the workshops; and if inspectors were put on in a parish and were left there for a considerable time, I believe they would be tampered with by some employers getting acquainted with them. I believe it would be very essential to have them changed from parish to parish, a fresh inspector coming from another parish to take the other inspector's place, so that no corruption could go on in that way. I believe that would be a very effective system to do away with it, because, I am certain that in most of the workshops, in my experience, the employers take prices below their materials, and they grind it out of the men's labour; they give the men such a low price, and then give them the opportunity to work day and night to make up a wage.

5031. Do you think the inspectors ought to have any practical knowledge of the trade?
No, not at all; I believe that a simple inspector is all that is required, simply to see that no person is employed beyond 10 hours or nine hours a day, and

six hours on Saturday. I know a particular shop where a man worked a little while ago. He had a family; he got so low, and his constitution was so broken up, that he was after that for six months in the hospital, and after he came back he could not proceed with his work; he worked day and night and Sundays, and then he could not make much money.

5032. Earl of *Derby*.] You propose that the limitation of labour to nine hours should be universal?

Yes.

5033. That it should be applied to grown up persons, as well as to women and children?

Yes, for the reason that I believe that would raise the price of the labour, because it would reduce the stock which is in the market, because there would not be so much production by it that means, and would give more people labour.

5034. I can understand such a regulation being enforced in a workshop where a large number of hands are employed together; but how could you enforce it in the case of people who worked in their own homes?

It could only be enforced where labour is employed by others; I do not think it could be enforced in the case of a man working in his own shop by himself, but I believe it ought to be enforced on any employer who has strange labour.

5035. Lord *Clinton*.] You think then that that inspection should extend to private houses?

Where there is a workshop or factory.

5036. But there is very often work done, and long hours in private houses; would you interfere with that?

If they made a private house into a workshop, I should think it would be so.

5037. Any house in which work was carried on and labour employed you would say, should be inspected?

Yes. I know of some houses where it is not stipulated in the lease that it shall not be done, where they carry it on to a large extent.

5038. And you think private houses of that kind should be inspected by the Government Inspector?

Yes, where work is done.

5039. Even where work is done only by the family?

No, where there is labour kept. Inspectors should inquire if strange labour is kept there, and those workshops should be visited. I believe that would go a long way towards remedying the overstocking of the market.

5040. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh*.] I suppose you would not extend it to the case where the person employed lived in the house?

Yes, I would, because he would be an employé for employers.

5041. But if he were one of the household that would make a difference?

If the work were carried on there, that shop should be registered.

5042. I mean this: A man may employ his son, or he may employ his nephew, or he may employ some very distant relation, and they all live in the house together; where are you going to draw the line between the man's relations; where does a person cease to be a relation and become an employé?

I believe it would be a mistake to make an exception with regard to the relations; because in some instances the employer who has relations would be very hard upon them, and he might sweat them against the moral law very much. I should think that the law should extend so far, except where a partner or the man himself worked; that even a father should not allow his son to work more than nine or ten hours per day. I believe this would go a long way to meet the case in respect to the sweating; because it is impossible that a man can be sweated when a man only works a certain number of hours, because the man is fresh

fresh, and the cabinet trade is not so hard that a man cannot work at any work for nine hours; that does not hurt him; in fact, I believe it does him good. I have always had that experience when I have been on the bench, when I worked regular hours.

5043. I only wanted to know exactly what you meant by a man's own family?
Yes, I think I understood your Lordship's question.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

THE REVEREND R. C. BILLING, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

5044. *Chairman.*] YOU are Rector of Spitalfields?
Yes.

5045. You are the Bishop Suffragan Designate of Bedford?
Yes.

5046. How long have you been Rector of Spitalfields?
Ten and a-half years.

5047. You have had large experience at Spitalfields among the poor population in the East End of London?
Yes, my experience has not been that of an ordinary clergyman, but I have had considerable experience in matters of trade, having had the superintendence of an institution which is supported by the liberality of the Baroness Burdett-Coutts, in which we do a great deal of work, enabling a woman, when she is the bread-winner and a competent seamstress, to do work in her own home, and so keep the family together. At the present time I have a contract for 1,300 shirts for the police force; and four years ago, when the Government were anxious to benefit the East End, and required a great number of flannel shirts for the Army, they found, owing to the sweating system, that it was impossible for them to benefit the poor in the way they wished by bringing the work to the East End, and at the request of the War Department I took a contract then for 5,000 flannel shirts, we doing the fitting in the institution, and putting the work out; and in that way I know something of what prices are, and of what a woman, and in some cases a man, can earn, if competent to do the work. The evil that we suffer from in the East End is largely owing to the fact that even good firms, who would refuse to employ a sweater, do not pay adequately for the work done, and when there is any press of work they come with contract work which they have taken and endeavour to get it taken at a lower figure, so that they may be able to make their profit. I have often had to refuse to take work from good firms, because they were not prepared to pay a price which would enable us, without a large outlay on the charity account, adequately to pay the workers. Then this evil is largely increased by what is known as the sweating system, by which those who have no capital, and have no real knowledge of the trade, take the work and put it out, without any care for the workers, only anxious to make as much as they possibly can out of the work that they have taken. The old middle men have almost disappeared. There were till within the last few years very respectable houses which took work from large firms and put it out.

5048. Up till about when would that be?
Up to the last five years. They have now almost entirely disappeared, having been driven out of the field by the sweaters. These middle-men understood their business; they only gave the work to those who were competent to do it, and for the most part they paid an adequate wage for the work done, and would refuse to allow the workers to be so pressed that they had to work night and day for the purpose of executing the order. That has passed away now.

The sweaters, as we know them now, care nothing about the rate of wages with reference to the earning power of those who work, nor how long nor in what a miserable condition they work. In the boot trade, as your Lordships have had evidence, the earnings of the worker are miserably small, and so they are in the ordinary clothing department. The question that is frequently pressed upon us is, Why do not these poor people combine; why do they allow themselves to be treated as they are? The fact is, as your Lordships know, that the circumstances of the case are numerously aggravated by the foreign pauper immigration. It is impossible to discover who is behind the scenes; or it has been found impossible hitherto to discover it; but the way these poor creatures are brought over, lends certainly colour to the suspicion that there is some combination somewhere. They are brought over. They almost stand in the market at the East End, after arrival, in a miserable plight, with hardly clothes to cover them, and without a penny in their pockets. They are taken in frequently and housed, and then they have, as slaves, to work for those who have given them shelter, and who have them there almost entirely at their own command and under their own control. Nothing could be more miserable than the condition of these immigrants when they arrive, except the condition to which they are reduced in those sweating dens, where they will be kept to labour till the early hours of the morning, and will be beginning again before ordinary people are about their business. I have seen, myself, these poor creatures at work up to two o'clock in the morning, and I have found that they were again at work, the same people and in the same room, at seven o'clock in the morning, working to a large extent just for their own maintenance and their own shelter. The work that is produced is very inferior work, and frequently it is returned, and they are fined. It is almost impossible for them under the present system to earn a sufficient livelihood. Then your Lordships may ask, Is there any remedy for this state of things? I am strongly of opinion that all places where labour is employed should be not only open to inspection, but should be regularly inspected. The places that they are allowed to erect now behind their dwellings, upon every little bit of ground that they can obtain, for the purpose of carrying on the sweating system, ought never to be permitted to be built in many cases; and when they are built they are ill-ventilated; there is no arrangement for decent living, and they are, for the most part, sadly overcrowded. These places ought to be regularly inspected. More than that, I should say that no place should be opened until it has been licensed; unless they are licensed, and a register kept of the places, it will be utterly impossible to get them under any proper regulation. But I should say that this inspection should not be confined to those places where strangers work, but that it should apply even where members of the family work. Unless there is that extension of the inspection it will be found that little good will be done. And I think that it should be unlawful to carry on work, for instance, the making the clothes, in ill-ventilated and crowded rooms, where the whole family has to live, where they feed, and where they sleep. In the parish of Spitalfields, within the last six or seven years, there were many people who occupied three or two rooms. The poor people now are driven to occupy one room for the most part. There they have to live by day and sleep by night, there they have to work, and there is to be found all the trade refuse in the room, creating, of course, an immense danger, not only to themselves but to their neighbours. I think that the hours of labour should and could be regulated. The price of such inspection and regulation would be great; but when you think of what is at stake, surely it would be regarded as a necessary expenditure. There is a great deal of work done by the Jews on their Sabbath. For the most part they are very particular about the observance of their own Sabbath; but many of that community have told me how a great deal of Sabbath work is done; and you can tell where it is done, where the blinds are drawn down, and where it is being done in secret; and a great number get no holiday at all. They do not keep the Jewish Sabbath; they do not keep the Christian Lord's Day; and they are kept hard at it, unable to escape, because they are absolutely destitute; and under this grinding tyranny, and on account of being foreigners to a great extent, they are unable to combine. Efforts have been

been made to rouse public opinion. During the last year I think as many as four meetings have been held in my own school-rooms by these poor creatures for the purpose of stating and ventilating their grievances. Of course at first there was a great deal of opposition, noisy opposition, on the part of those who were anxious to maintain the system, but of course we knew how to deal with that. If the alterations I would suggest are to be carried out, there must be an increase of the number of inspectors under the Factory Act, and the terms of the Factory Act must be so enlarged as to embrace those places that are not now known as factories. The inspectors at present find it utterly impossible to do their duty. It would take an inspector almost all his time to deal with one or two streets in Spitalfields. I would require the places to be constantly visited, and the power of the inspector should be enlarged; he should be able summarily to close a place where he sees that the occupation of it is endangering not only the lives but the morals of the people. No one who has not lived amongst these people can have any idea of the awful results of the way in which they are thus herded together for the purpose of just making a livelihood and living at as cheap a rate as possible.

5049. You mean the moral results?
Yes, the moral and physical results.

5050. You are speaking principally of Jews, I understand you?
I am speaking principally of Jews.

5051. Does your remark refer to Christians also?
There are very few Christians in my part connected with the sweating system; in Bethnal Green there are more. All the Jews, for the most part, in the first instance come to our neighbourhood; then when they are able to improve their condition they move off elsewhere, and a fresh consignment comes to us. But no one can form any idea what they are. I have the honour of the acquaintance and friendship of a great many of the leading Jews, the Deputy Chief Rabbi and others, who are themselves much concerned at the dreadful condition of their co-religionists; but they do not know what I know, nor can I persuade them that occasional visits to the East End do not give that knowledge which a man possesses who lives there 24 hours out of a day, and therefore has an opportunity at all times of seeing and knowing what is going on. We are constantly compelled to put the law in action and to send the sanitary inspector in (but it is a very cumbrous process), and this in the interests of the people themselves, on account of the condition in which they are. I believe that the sanitary inspectors ought not only to be increased in number, but that the sanitary inspectors should be appointed by, or at all events should be amenable only to, a central authority. The sanitary inspectors now are appointed, in the case of our neighbourhood, by the local Board of Works, and are removable by that body. In the case of a poor law officer he is appointed by the guardians, but he is not removable at the will of the guardians without the consent of the Local Government Board. I say it emphatically, the sanitary officers ought to be independent of the local authority, and until they are thus independent, and there is an independent force of factory inspectors who are sufficient for the work, and have their powers so enlarged that they can deal with all places where work is taken in, you will not touch the sweating system, nor will you prevent a great moral evil, nor will you prevent infectious disease constantly being carried to all parts of the metropolis.

5052. If I understand you, you do not object to the existence of the middleman, but you object to the middleman as he at present exists?
As he at present exists; the middleman is almost necessary, unless, what would be much better, the work was done in the workshops of the firms who have the work to do. The difficulty there is, that the demand for clothes, for instance, is not constant; there are times when there is a greater pressure at one time than at another, and so they prefer not keeping a number of hands on at a large factory, which must be kept in repair, and all appliances there, but rather trust to be able to put out the work and to sweat it out of the people by long hours of labour when the pressure comes upon them.

 5053. A great

5053. A great deal of this sewing work is done, and must be done, must it not, in the homes of the people?

Not of necessity.

5054. Is it not done a great deal by married women with families?

There are some that do it, but for the most part a great number of those who are employed are those who might just as well work away from home as at home; but where the married women do work, those rooms ought to be under inspection.

5055. What is the name of the society with which you are connected, which gives work to seamstresses?

It is not a public society, but in days gone by, when cholera was rife in the East End of London, the Baroness Burdett Coutts had what was called a sewing school, for the purpose of providing employment for women there who were in distress. That has become almost a permanent institution, I may hope, in which a great deal of work is done. Contract work is taken, it is fitted in the place (Brown's Lane House), and then allowed to be done by competent seamstresses in their own homes.

5056. I understand you that you have not infrequently to refuse orders from first-rate houses on account of the lowness of the price?

Yes; when there is a pressure upon them and they wish to get the work done, they come down and offer us work, saying, "Will you take this and get this done." They know it will be properly done, but frequently we have to refuse it, and there is a great deal of haggling about the price, and often we have to refuse it entirely because they will not pay a proper price. We find that work which has been put out from public institutions to firms, is put out again by those firms when they are very much pressed, and then again put out by the second firm in different lots, and then you get to this want of consideration for others, you get the opportunity for the sweater; the man comes forward and says, "Well, I will get this done."

5057. When you say that you were obliged to refuse the work offered, on account of the lowness of the price, do you mean that you could not make the article for that price at a profit?

We do not care about a profit, through the kindness of the lady who assists us; the establishment charges will be borne by her. A woman has all she earns, and we feel that we must decline to take work at a price which would not enable her to receive what she ought to receive for her work.

5058. In the ordinary course you would be able, I suppose, to take one of those orders if you wished, and to put it out and make some profit yourself, and get the work done by others?

If we had it in the first instance. There is a public institution (I forget now what it was, so it is not safe to make a guess), that we applied to for work some time ago, and they informed us that their work was never put out in that way. We knew the fact to be not so, because we had actually had work from that institution brought to us which had come to us through others, through firms which had taken it, but were unable to execute the order and then tried to sweat us, but we declined to be sweated.

5059. I suppose the growth of the existing middleman, the sweater, has destroyed the old-fashioned middleman?

That is so.

5060. You spoke just now of "ordinary clothing"; what do you mean by ordinary clothing?

We might say, common clothing. We sometimes do work of a finer kind. We get work from friends and others at the West End, and we are very glad to execute it sometimes, though we hardly meet expenses, because it is better to assist the meritorious poor by allowing them to earn money than to give them doles.

5061. Does this pauper immigration, of which you have spoken, tend to increase?

I cannot say that it does tend to increase, but it has not diminished to the extent that some may think. Week by week they are still arriving. The Jewish authorities are most anxious to stop it. It is not long ago that a body of immigrants were sent back to Hamburg, because of the miserable condition to which they would be reduced if they landed in England. They had been allowed to step off the quays in Hamburg into the boat; they were not allowed to step off the boat on to the quays. They are quite ready to allow them to come to us, but not ready to receive them back again.

5062. Do you think that they will not take them back?

No. We receive anything that is shot on our shore, from Greek gipsies downwards.

5063. In your suggestions as to possible remedies you have not said anything about checking immigration; do you think it ought to be checked?

I think it ought to be checked. I know that the condition of many of these poor creatures is sad in the country from which they are coming; but I know that their condition here is most miserable, and that they largely contribute to pauperise native Englishmen. It is said sometimes that you do not find these people in the workhouse or receiving parochial relief; but they are the cause of the pauperism of many others. They can and do work under conditions under which the Englishman cannot and will not work.

5064. And you think that they have displaced a certain amount of native labour?

They have very largely displaced it.

5065. And a large proportion of that labour, in your opinion, has become pauperised?

Yes.

5066. Not having anything else to turn its hand to?

They must either become casual labourers or they must be emigrated to make room for those who are constantly arriving here from other lands.

5067. I suppose the bootmaking and tailoring trades are the last refuge for labour?

Yes; they take care to keep these poor creatures under their control by a subdivision of labour; they do not learn how to do the whole article; only one part of it. It is impossible for them in any way to work by themselves.

5068. Do you think that that is done purposely, or is it not a natural result?

It is a natural result, I will confess, in one way; it obtains in other trades at Clerkenwell in the watch trade, for instance; but still I am persuaded that there is a disposition to prevent them gaining independence by being able to produce the complete article. The Jewish Board of Guardians are very kind and very liberal, and do seek to administer their charity on wise principles, but the difficulty of their position is very great, and there can be no doubt that they assist, we may say, unintentionally to keep these people in the condition in which they are. When they are in great distress they receive some relief from the Jewish Board of Guardians, but then, for the most part, it is not such relief as permanently benefits them; it does not put them on their feet and enable them to be independent, but assists them in a crisis, and so tends to keep them permanently in the position in which they are.

5069. Do many of these people emerge from this condition that you have described?

Very few indeed; there are some who are able to get out of it in time. I should like to mention what I see every Friday morning when I am in the habit of attending at the Old Castle-street Board School, which was the first school opened by the London School Board, in which there are now about 1,500 children, and not 20 Gentiles there, though close by there are two large

Jewish schools which are full, providing accommodation for 5,000 children, and other Board Schools in our neighbourhood are fast becoming Jewish schools. What I see there every Friday morning is this, poor miserable starved children, and the parents coming begging for remission of the fees. They can speak very little English, sometimes no English at all; they have come from all parts of the Continent. To look at the men and women makes your heart bleed, and when you ask them "What do you do," they tell you that they do what they can; they get what work they can, slipper-making, anything they can just manage to get.

5070. You spoke about these people being taken in on their arrival; are they generally taken in at first by friends?

Sometimes by friends, but very often by those who see that there is an opportunity of getting something out of them.

5071. Are these regular agents, crimps, who look out for them?

As I said, no one has yet been able to discover what that organisation is which brings them over; but evidently there is some organisation; I am confident of that in my own mind.

5072. What cause do they generally give as that which induces them to come over; you have often asked them, I suppose?

Because they have heard that they will do better in England, and often one cannot help sincerely sympathising with them, because they are fleeing from persecution and outrage elsewhere. For the most part they can hardly credit it that they are in a free country when they first arrive.

5073. Do you think that to a considerable extent they come here from a desire to evade military service?

That is so, in some cases, but I do not think it is largely so.

5074. Then I understand that the general process is that they come over here destitute as a rule, and that they work for some time merely for a bare subsistence?

Yes.

5075. And, I presume, that after learning some branch of a trade they get small wages?

Yes. Your Lordships should bear in mind that these Jewish immigrants are in a very peculiar position. They cannot go into ordinary employment under Gentile masters as journeymen in any way, on account of the restrictions which their religious creed imposes upon them; they cannot be put to agricultural labour, not under Gentiles, there are so many times when they could not work. There is a whole class of young people in our part who get their living by, as they say, poking fires for the Jews; that is, attending on some of those who can afford to pay them some little sum, one girl taking several families, to do what work their law forbids them to do at certain seasons; and so these poor creatures must do this work which their own co-religionists offer to them, or do nothing. They cannot fall into the ordinary labour market, and go where they please and do what they please. That is a matter which always has to be borne in mind in considering this subject.

5076. Is it a fact that the Jews and Christians never work together?

Very seldom.

5077. They do occasionally?

Yes, occasionally, but very very seldom. There is a great prejudice on the part of the Gentiles to work with Jews, and though I should be very sorry to make a sweeping accusation against the whole Jewish community, these poor creatures who are brought over here (I say "brought," for I can hardly conceive of their coming unless they were brought) have no knowledge of the common decencies of life. If I were to tell your Lordships now, facts that have come continually under my own observation, it would put a strain, I am sure, upon your ability to trust my veracity.

5078. As

5078. As to the conditions under which they live, you mean?
As to the conditions under which they live. But I say that I should be very sorry to bring a general accusation against the community. I know that the better class of the Jews are most anxious to improve the condition of these poor creatures. The only people, I think, in London whose condition is at all like that of the Jews in our part, are the poor Italians; but that is not in my neighbourhood.

5079. This condition of things, you have stated, is both physically and morally injurious to them?
Certainly.

5080. Do you consider that the influx of this foreign labour has created the trade in slop clothing and the cheap trade in boots and shoes, or do you think that the trade existed before?
I think it has very largely created it, so far as my knowledge goes; but that would be taking one back beyond the time during which I have experience of the East End.

5081. And if the immigration of these people were stopped, or checked, it would probably have the result of losing that particular trade to this country?
I do not think there would be much disadvantage in loosing trade in that way, because I am confident that English manufactures are being discredited by the production of what these poor creatures are alone able, frequently, to produce, and have to produce under the circumstances in which they are placed; they could be made good manufactures.

5082. Do you think that if the sanitary inspection were more fully carried out, and better sanitary conditions were enforced, that in itself would remedy, to a large extent, the evils which exist now?
To a very large extent. It would produce, as your Lordships can see at once, many alterations in the condition of things.

5083. Do you think that to do it, it would be necessary that the sanitary inspectors should be appointed by the Government and not by the local authorities?
I would not object to their being appointed by the local authority; but they ought not to be removable at the pleasure of the local authority. I instanced the different condition of the sanitary inspector under the local Board of Works or Vestry, and the relieving officer, or any other officer who is employed by the guardians. The guardians appoint him, but they cannot remove him, unless they can show to the Local Government Board just cause for removal.

5084. You think also that there ought to be more of them?
Certainly; and if they were paid out of imperial taxation rather than local taxes, there would not be a disposition so much on the part of the local authorities to keep the number down.

5085. The natural desire is to keep the rates down?
Yes, and there is a natural desire to oblige your neighbour, too, on the understanding that if you do not inspect his building he will not inspect yours.

5086. In your experience is there much confusion in their minds on the part of the sanitary and factory inspectors as to their duties?
The factory inspectors endeavour to do their duty to the utmost; but it is impossible for them, under the existing law and the state of things at the East End, adequately to deal with this evil.

5087. It has been suggested to us that in some cases the sanitary inspector thinks that it is the duty of the factory inspector, and the factory inspector thinks that it is the duty of the sanitary inspector; is that so, do you think?
Yes, there is that confusion; it is difficult to know to whom to apply; you are sent from one to the other.

 5088. I understand

5088. I understand you that you would advocate that every room in which work is done for a profit should be registered as a workshop?
Yes.

5089. And should be subject to inspection?
Yes, not inquisitorial, but necessary inspection.

5090. By the factory inspector?
Yes.

5091. And you suggest also, I think, that the inspector should have summary powers?
Summary powers to this extent, that where a great evil exists, which is dangerous to the health and morals of people, they should be able to act at once; though there be an appeal, they should be able to act at once, rather than have to go through the process of laying an information.

5092–3. Do you think they should have sufficient summary power to close a room?
To close a room if it is in an insanitary condition, overcrowded, ill-ventilated. It might be necessary to guard the liberty of the subject by not allowing a factory inspector to act alone. If it is a question of removing a supposed lunatic to an asylum, two doctors must certify. In the same way it might be allowed that the inspector should bring in another professional from another part; something might be arranged to enable him to act at once. But if those who have these places know that it is a cumbrous process that has to be gone through before anything can really be done, and then in the meantime they get matters cleared up a little bit, and then the matter is dropped; then presently you are perhaps in a worse condition than you were before.

5094. Would you give the inspectors under the Factory and Workshops Act power to deal with insanitary places?
Yes.

5095. You would combine the duties at present exercised by the two inspectors in the one?
Yes, I should.

5096. Would you propose to charge any fee for the registration of workshops?
I have not thought upon that. There is no reason why it should not be done that I know of.

5097. As I understand you, you propose to limit the hours of male labour?
Yes.

5098. In any particular trade or locality?
I would not allow these places to be open more than a certain number of hours, or, at all events, I would require them to be closed for a certain number of hours. That would be the most simple way of doing it, that they must close at a certain hour at night, and not open before a certain hour in the morning.

5099. Would you extend that all over the country, or limit it to any trade?
I have not studied it beyond my own locality.

5100. But supposing it were only necessary in your own locality, it might not be necessary in every trade in your locality?
No, perhaps not.

5101. Could you suggest any way in which such an Act, if there was one, could be limited to a particular locality or trade?
No, I am not prepared to suggest any way on the spur of the moment; but I do not think the difficulty would be found insuperable.

5102. You have no suggestion as to the way in which, if it were considered desirable to check it, this pauper immigration should be checked?
I think there should be a registration of all arrivals; and in fact that is required under an old Act of William the 4th, but it is not acted upon; and it seems to me, that unless those who may arrive can show that they have means for

for their temporary support, or some hope of employment, unless there is someone to receive them to whom they have been, as it were, consigned, as in the case of sending emigrants to our own Colonies, they should not be received. The United States of America, where they have an abundant supply of unlimited territory for them, will not receive them.

5103. Do you know at all what the Jewish population in your parish is?
It is difficult exactly to say. I suppose, in the parish of Christchurch, commonly known as Spitalfields, the Jewish population now is about 12,000.

5104. Men, women, and children?
Yes; but then there are a great many round about.

5105. Can you give us any estimate of the number of new arrivals in a year?
No, I have no reliable figures; but I know that during the last four years whole streets have become entirely occupied by Jews, foreign Jews, where there was not a Jew before.

5106. What has become of the native population?
They have been pushed out. In our part there are few, if any, small houses; they are old mansions. If a Jew gets into one room, he very soon gets a neighbour into another, and at last it is made intolerable for the Gentiles, and they must leave; sometimes at last they may be actually bought out, the last tenants.

5107. Are there any societies, besides the Jewish Board of Guardians, that assist these people?
No, I am not aware of any other.

5108. And they do not amalgamate, as I understand you, with the Gentiles?
No.

5109. The Gentiles do not like the Jews, and the Jews cannot work with the Gentiles on account of the regulations that their religion imposes upon them?
Yes.

5110. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury*.] I suppose you think that if there is any organisation which brings over the Jews to this country, it is a commercial organisation?
Yes.

5111. Is there any indication of that, beyond the mere fact that the Jews arrive?
No; that is the only indication, the fact that they come and they are received. There are those who are looking out for them and take them in.

5112. But they are clearly expecting them?
Clearly expecting them, as a professional man who lives in the neighbourhood the other day said to me, at the top of Hanbury-street, you might see frequently the new arrivals in a morning standing there, just with their few little belongings wrapped up in bundles, waiting for some one to come along and take them in.

5113. Then it does not look quite as if there were a commercial organisation consigning them.
No, not that; those evidently have come over "on spec."

5114. Some inducement has brought them over?
Yes.

5115. What became of the people who were taken back to Hamburg?
They came back here again.

5116. And were discharged after all upon our shores?
Yes.

5117. Is there no power, has not the local board power, to prevent the creation of those unsanitary sheds and workshops of which you have spoken.

They have, but the requirements of the local Acts are not sufficiently stringent. Persons are able to put up what, I think, ought not to be erected.

5118. Are there not officers appointed who should see to every kind of erection.

Yes, but I think it is not the fault of the officers, but the fault of the law, that these people are allowed to cover all space behind the ordinary dwellings, where it is impossible to erect a sanitary workshop, and to interfere with the proper ventilation of the neighbourhood.

5119. There is no authority which can forbid the erection upon those grounds?

No, the local authorities do see that the law is obeyed as it at present exists; but the law is not, in my judgment, sufficiently stringent.

5120. If these places were suddenly closed by inspectors, would it not necessitate more relief being provided because a certain number of people would be prevented from earning wages?

Certainly, it would make a great alteration in that respect for a time.

5121. It would throw a large number of people upon the rates?

Yes; but that would be very much better than allowing the present state of things to exist.

5122. You lay great stress upon the fact that you believed that the hours could be regulated, but you admit that there would be a difficulty in doing it?

There would be a difficulty; I think they could be regulated. The simplest plan would be to forbid the shops being used during certain hours.

5123. But then would not a great deal of work be carried home?

But I would have the same rule applied to work taken into what is called a private room.

5124. You said no good would be done unless the family workshops were inspected?

No, that is necessary, I will then say.

5125. Will you say why?

Because they are the greatest evil that we have to contend with. A man and his wife and children live in a small room; they several of them work there; they bring in others to work there, till the place is crowded, so that there is hardly room to move.

5126–7. Then they would cease to be family workshops?

At present such a room is considered a family workshop, because it is the man's own living room. When the living room has become a place to which others are brought it ought to be taken out of the category of a private house.

5128. With regard to the institutions to which you referred, did you mean to say that the institutions whose work was put out to sweaters were not aware that it was put out because they went to good firms, or do you mean that the institutions are aware that it is sweated?

I think they are aware of it to a great extent. I have spoken to the heads of respectable firms, and they have been extremely surprised at what I was able to inform them of; they could not believe that it was so until, on inquiry, they found it to be true. Until the heads of great firms in London and elsewhere will look after their own business to some extent, instead of delegating all the authority to foremen and others, who naturally are most anxious to produce the best results, you will get very little change.

5129. But it would be possible for the great firms to effect a considerable change?

Yes, if they were content with less returns, and attended really more directly to the business themselves. The answer often given is, "Oh, I cannot interfere with that department; that is Mr. Such-and-Such's." Mr. Such-and-Such knows that, though he may be told to treat all that are employed fairly, it will go

go hardly with him at the time of stocktaking if he has not produced as good a balance as he did last time. And those who, in my judgment, thus very sadly neglect their duty, are, many of them, those that we all honour as most philanthropic and charitable people. I would rather that their earnings were a little less, and they had less to give away, and so this evil was reduced.

5130. Lord *Thring.*] We have been told that the Jewish paupers, be they foreign or native, do not come upon the rates except in most exceptional cases; I understand that you do not think that is the case; have I rightly understood you?

No; I do say distinctly that very few of them do come upon the rates, but they are the cause of many others coming upon the rates.

5131. Then, with respect to the children, do I understand you rightly that th Board schools in your district are principally taken up with educating Jewish children?

The Old Castle-street School is now almost entirely a Jewish school. There are a very large number of children in that school this morning who cannot speak a word of English; we have to teach them English in the first place. There are not 20 Gentiles in that school.

5132. Because I understood a former witness to say that the Jewish children are mainly educated at the expense of the Jewish Board of Guardians?

There are the Jewish Free School and the Jewish Infant School in Bell-lane and Commercial-street. You may put down the attendance there at about 5,000; but, in addition to that, Old Castle-street School is a Jewish school actually now. In Settle-street School two-thirds of the children are Jewish. Hanbury-street School is now applying for Jewish teachers on account of the large number of Jews there.

5133. Then in your opinion a very large number, do you say the greater number, of the Jewish children in the east of London are educated at the Board schools, and not at the Jewish schools?

A large number. I could not say whether the School Board or the Jewish community is educating the larger number.

5134. With respect to the society which the Baroness Burdett Coutts was good enough to institute, do you in that institution employ Jewesses?

No; that is for Gentiles entirely.

5135. That is going on now?

Yes.

5136. It is conducted not on commercial principles but on charitable principles?

Yes; what I might call the establishment charges are borne by the Baroness; she pays for the rent of the house, and she pays also for the wages of those who have to superintend the work.

5137. Then with respect to your remedies; supposing you gave a power of summary closure to the inspector, would it not have this effect, that a very large quantity of the Jewish population, according to your account, would be taken away, and where would you put them, into the workhouses?

They would have to go into the workhouses, if it were necessary, for their own sake.

5138. They would of necessity, would they not, according to your own account. You tell us, what I am afraid is too true, that the whole place is overcrowded, and that the sanitary conditions are extremely bad. If you gave this summary power the effect of it would be to send to the Gentile workhouses the whole of the population?

I should be quite prepared for the time to face that evil.

5139. And that you would propose to do?

If that were the result I should be quite prepared to face it; but I do not know

know that it would be the consequence, because very likely there would be efforts made on the part of philanthropic people (and none are more ready to help than the Jewish) to avoid their being driven into the workhouse. We have a certain number in our workhouse, and a larger number in our infirmary, which is a department of the workhouse where we have a Jewish ward, and arrangements made for providing the Jews with such food, cooked after their own manner, as they can partake of.

5140. That is another point. Then a considerable number of Jews are in your workhouse now, are they?

No, I must not say a considerable number; those that are in-door paupers are not so much in the workhouse as in the infirmary.

5141. Then I understand with respect to these immigrants (we have been told so over and over again) that they are flying from persecution in many cases; you would be prepared to face a law which would refuse to receive these Russians that fly from intolerable persecution?

My own experience is that the majority of those who actually fly from persecution are not the paupers that the others are; those who are flying from persecution are for the most part those who have got something.

5142. We were told by extremely good evidence that Polish Jews will live on considerably less than any other human being, that they are really in a most miserable state and condition, and one of those Jews said that they were flying from perscoution?

There will be some cases of that kind.

5143. You would be prepared to refuse to admit by the law of England men flying from persecution?

Yes, unless I could make some arrangement for bettering their position here. They are flying from one great evil to another, and producing an intolerable evil here.

5144. Earl of *Derby*.] You have spoken of the condition of these Jewish immigrants as being in many cases extremely bad; did you refer to their moral or to their physical condition; is there anything against their morals generally?

Yes, a very large number of them seem to be unaware of what we know as the ordinary decencies of life; but, as I said before, I should be very very sorry if it was supposed that I was speaking of the Jewish community generally; it is of this class that I am speaking.

5145. You are speaking of these persons who come over in a state of extreme poverty?

Yes.

5146. And I suppose we may take it that their sanitary arrangements are very bad, or that they hardly exist all?

And if you make sanitary arrangements for them they know not how to use them, and it is almost impossible to keep them in order. I can speak from experience of two large blocks of buildings erected some time ago for the accommodation specially of Jewish tailors.

5147. Do you think it would be possible to exclude immigrants who were not in danger of becoming paupers, merely on the ground that they work harder and live cheaper than English people?

No, I should be very sorry to do that; if they have the means of present subsistence, and can show that they will have an opportunity of work, I would open the English market to them as I should like to see the foreign market open to the English labourer.

5148. Then you would simply put matters on the same footing as in America, where the immigrant is expected to be able to show that he can get his own living?

Yes.

5149. Would

5149. Would that materially reduce the immigration; would not the great majority of immigrants be able to show that?
No, it would reduce the number, and reduce the number of those whom we are most anxious to exclude.

5150. You spoke about their being sent over by some agency; but you can give no positive information on that?
No; I said I had never been able to discover that.

5151. Now, as to your proposal that all places where labour is employed should be regularly inspected, are there not many cases where a man works at home with only the help of his wife, and perhaps his children?
Very few amongst this community.

5152. In the majority of cases you think there are others besides the family?
There are others that come and work in the same room.

5153. They work in workshops, though those workshops are in their private houses?
Yes, are known as private rooms.

5154. There would be no difficulty in pointing out the houses where this kind of labour goes on?
Not at all, no difficulty; we should require an adequate number of inspector for a time.

5155. I suppose that applies also to what you say as to the regulation of the hours of labour?
Yes.

5156. You would not interfere with a man working in his private house?
Not if others were not working there.

5157. But if he brings other men in to work with him, from your point of view that ceases to be a private house?
Yes, whether they are called cousins or nephews.

5158. You have spoken of the demand for labour in the trades with which they are principally concerned as not being constant, but very fluctuating?
Take the clothiers' trade; there are times when there is a great demand for certain articles different times of the year; during the summer you are making clothing for the winter; during the winter you are providing for the summer. A great deal has to be done according to the season of the year and according to the promise of the season. If there is a late spring, a great deal of work is put off; then, if it suddenly turns to fine promising weather, of course you have to get the work done within the time before the demand for it, according to the season, passes away.

5159. But does not that fact in itself account for a great deal of the distress, namely, that the demand for labour being uncertain, many men are tempted into the business for whom permanent occupation cannot be found?
It accounts for it in conjunction with the very lamentable fact that at present there is no adequate idea among the people of what thrift means; they think that they must spend all they earn, and that if a man is earning so much for so many weeks that should be accounted as his normal income during the year.

5160. But, taking the class of people with whom we are dealing, is frugality possible amongst them; can they save out of their ordinary earnings?
No; many of them hardly get any earnings; they are kept there, and they live; how they do live it is almost impossible to say; they live on very little, and they are very temperate.

5161. But is not the bottom of the whole difficulty this, that there are more people wanting employment than there is employment to be found for them?
Yes, and we are constantly increasing the number of those wanting employment.

5162. You mean by foreign immigration?
Foreign immigration is one cause; there are other causes.

5163. We have been told that the increases which is due to immigration from abroad is very small when compared to that which is due to the natural growth of the population at home; what do you say to that?
My answer to that is this; I test such a statement by the fact that in a neighbourhood like ours I find whole batches of buildings in which there are those that cannot speak a word of English; I know they cannot have been very long in England. Then, if I take the children in the schools, I find there a large number of those who are unacquainted with English.

5164. Do you think that the majority of these people become naturalised and adopt the habits of Englishmen?
No, nor will they as long as they live together, as they do, under the most disadvantageous circumstances.

5165. Then the remedy that you suggest is twofold; in the first place you would check the immigration in the manner which you have described?
Yes.

5166. And in the next place you would enforce better sanitary regulations, which should at the same time check overwork?
Yes.

5167. But that would not, to any material extent, diminish the great evil of over-competition for employment?
No, I have not touched the question of over-competition.

5168. Lord *Clinton.*] I think you said that in your institution you did not care about profits?
No.

5169. Then of course you are able to give better wages to the workpeople than if it were a purely commercial undertaking?
The charitable part of it is that what I may call the establishment charges, are borne; there is nothing to take out of the wages for rent, but the woman has all that she earns.

5170. Then how do you fix your rate of wages?
We take the rate of wages according to what we consider is a due remuneration for the work done. I have a table here of what we have been working on lately, stating the price paid for button holes, machine stitching, tacking, and finishing.

5171. Will you give those?
We have been paying lately for button holes, from 2½ *d.* to 3 *d.* per dozen; machine stitching, 1 *s.* 7 *d.* per dozen; tacking, 2 *s.* per dozen; finishing, that varies considerably according to the nature of the shirt; these are the police shirts, that would be from 5 *d.* to 8 *d.* per shirt; there is often a difference in respect of wristbands, collars, lining, and other things.

5172. With reference to button holing, 3 *d.* per dozen, is that very much above what is given by the ordinary trade?
Yes, that is considerably above.

5173. Then with regard to this terrible condition in which you say the lowest class of Jews live, I suppose that consists generally in the over-crowding and insanitary conditions generally?
Yes, insanitary conditions generally.

5174. But then, I suppose, the sanitary inspector has power to go in and inspect?
Yes; but what are you to do? We have two sanitary inspectors, and they do their best; and the Jewish authorities have also tried to better, and have succeeded in some instances in bettering, the condition of the people; but where you

you have this constant influx, and have to accommodate week by week more people within a certain area, the insanitary condition naturally increases.

5175. But you think that the sanitary inspectors do all they can?
All they can; but as soon as they are gone the evil is there again; you have no power to close the place.

5176. And you think the number of them ought to be increased?
Yes; I do not think people ought to be allowed to live in the condition in which they are there.

5177. All this inspection, you think, should be under one inspector, not under two inspectors, one being for factory and the other for sanitary purposes?
Yes; I think there should be one inspector. You would require in a district a sanitary inspector for such places as would not be touched by the factory inspector; but when a place was registered under the Factory Act I would make the factory inspector the sanitary inspector there.

5178. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Of course, your institution has no particular power; is it able to exercise any control over the places in which, and the hours during which, the work is done?
Yes.

5179. You find you have no practical difficulty in seeing to that?
No, we take care of that.

5180. Lord *Monskwell.*] Do greeners live in London under different conditions from the poor Christian residents in Russia and Poland, do you suppose?
I do not know.

5181. You have no knowledge of that?
No.

5182. If the registration of private rooms were impracticable, would you compel married women, with families, to work in registered workshops, a married woman, for instance, by herself, with children?
I did not suggest any registration of a private room if there was no one from without working in the room; but what I intended was this: there are so many places spoken of as private rooms, because they are the rooms in which the people live, but they are really workrooms in which other people work.

5183. When you say that some of the work you refuse goes to the sweaters, and you refuse it on account of the price not being high enough, do not you suppose that the same persons to whom you refuse to give this work get worse-paid work from the sweater afterwards?
Yes.

5184. Do not you encourage sweating by refusing to take this work?
Yes; but we could not afford to take it.

5185. Do you benefit the poorest class?
No; the object of this institution is not so much to benefit the poorest class; it is intended to benefit those seamstresses, married women; they must be good seamstresses. It is only a limited number that we can employ; a very few in my own immediate neighbourhood now, who are the bread-winners, and to assist them to keep the home together, so that they shall not have to come upon the poor law.

5186. So that you recognise that you do not benefit the poorest class?
Decidedly.

5187. Lord *Rothschild.*] I understand you to say that the sanitary condition of the houses where the poor Jews live is of the worst possible description?
Yes.

5188. I suppose you are aware that there is a sanitary department of the Jewish Board of Guardians?
Yes.

5189. And also that that department tried, and tried in vain, to get these houses put in order?
I know.

5190. And that they did not find so much difficulty from the sanitary inspectors as from the local bodies themselves, who are presumed to be the owners of these houses?
I said that the sanitary inspectors ought to be independent of the local authority. But the local authorities are powerless to demolish; this power belongs to the Metropolitan Board of Works.

5191. I think you also mentioned that there are a certain number of Jews in the infirmary; that is of late occurrence, is it not?
There have been Jews in it ever since I knew it; the number has increased of late.

5192. I think it was owing to your own kindness. There was a dispensary attached to the Jewish Board of Guardians, and you were one of those who suggested that medicine was not Jewish or Christian, but was universal?
Yes; I was most anxious that in the poor law infirmary there should be such arrangements made that the Jew might be able to be there under circumstances agreeable to his own conscience, and we have therefore a department for them. We very frequently, constantly, have in the infirmary those with whom it is very difficult to communicate in any way; we have to send almost all over London to find some man to communicate with them.

5193. *Chairman.*] You read out a list of the prices you pay to your work-people, and you said that they are considerably larger than the prices given by the sweating middleman?
Yes.

5194. Can you state the prices paid by the sweaters?
That depends so much upon the article; it depends upon the nature of the work required; it depends so much upon the material; some material can be worked much more easily than others.

5195. Do you know at all whether high-class goods, such as are sold in first class West-end shops, are made up in your parish?
Yes; not to any great extent now; they are gone beyond us. They were made there some time ago.

5196. But they are made under these conditions?
Yes.

5197. Therefore, the danger from infectious disease which you spoke of extends all over London?
Yes, it is a real danger.

5198. You said that the Jews do not conform to the Gentile mode of living; do you mean that they do not in the case of the second or third generation of Jews?
No, they keep a distinct community.

5199. As to the immigration of these pauper foreigners, will you tell us at all whether the numbers fluctuate very much?
Yes, there are times when there is a greater influx than at others.

5200. Can you form any opinion as to whether that is due to the demand over here, or to the condition of things in the countries from which they come?
To the condition of things in the countries from which they come; not to a demand for them here, but to all kinds of false reports.

5201. That is what I mean by a "demand"?
Yes, it is due to that; when we say, "Here you are," they constantly say, "We were told to come here."

5202. So

5202. So that if the congestion were removed by emigration, would it be, in your opinion, at once filled up by immigration?
Yes; emigration cannot relieve us of our difficulties as long as we permit this kind of immigration.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. FREDERICK CHARLES BAUM, having been re-called; is further Examined, as follows:

5203. *Chairman.*] You wish to correct a statement you made the other day?
Yes, I wish to correct my reply to Question 3067. I was asked to give a typical case as to loss of time incurred by workmen not being paid for the time in the alteration of work caused by no fault of their own. I gave a typical case of a couch made for Her Majesty. I find that, instead of its being three days which the workman lost, one day was the time that he lost upon that particular job.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. HENRY DAVIS is called in; and, having been sworn is, Examined, as follows:

5204. *Chairman.*] You are a Furrier, are you not?
A wholesale furrier.

5205. How do you divide the furrier trade?
We have three classes of workmen in our trade: the work that is done on the premises by the wholesale manufacturers; the better-class trade, which is not in any way affected by the system you are inquiring into; and the poor class, the common work, that is done by the Jew in Whitechapel.

5206. And that is affected by it?
Very considerably, to the extent that it is now entirely in the hands of the Jews.

5207. Do you do all your work on your own premises?
No; I have for many years given out a lot of work among the poor Jews in the East-end, and I at one time had my warehouse in the very same street where the last witness, Mr. Billing, has his rectory.

5208. Where is your establishment?
Now at No. 39, Jewin-street, City; but I used to be in Spitalfields.

5209. And you put out a portion of your work to Jews?
To Jews; we do not call them sweaters in the trade, but we call them "chamber masters." The man who goes between the labourer on the one side and the capitalist on the other in the fur trade is called a "chamber master;" he takes the work out and employs men under him, and assists in doing it himself.

5210. How many men do they ordinarily employ?
It depends upon the quantity of work he gets from the wholesale warehouses.

5211. What is the kind of the work he does himself?
He performs the cutting, and the sewing, and the nailing; of course he could not do all himself, and would have to employ other people. It is a very large industry in the East-end of London. I think that next to the tailoring, boot-making, cabinet-making, cigar-making, the fur trade, I think, would rank fifth

fifth among the industries of the East-end. There are some thousands of women, both native and foreign, employed in the trade, and hundreds of men, mostly foreigners.

5212. Do you get orders from other houses yourself?
I get orders from the wholesale City warehouses.

5213. Then you execute that part of the order yourself and put out a part of it?

Yes; these are all orders from the large City houses, such as Morley's, and Cook's, and Rylands', and all the bigger firms in the City.

5214. Where do these foreigners come from?
I have been among the Jews, lived among them all my lifetime, and speak their language. They come principally from three distant parts: firstly, from Russia, and a great many from a part of Russia called the Littan, and a man who comes from the Littan would be called a Littock. Then there is another class that would come from Roumania; and a third class would come from the country that was once Poland, but now belongs partly to Germany, Russia, and Austria.

5215. I suppose on arriving here they are totally ignorant of English?
Totally ignorant of it. They are brought here, in my opinion, by three various reasons. The first, which applies mostly to the male adults, is because they are afraid of serving their country as soldiers; they go away because they do not want to become, as they say, "zellner soldaten," soldiers; and then their most intolerable persecution is another reason.

5216. What do you mean by persecution?
Jewish persecution; simply for the mere fact of their being Jews they are persecuted.

5217. Do you mean religious persecution, or race persecution?
Religious persecution.

5218. To your own knowledge have you come across any men who have been persecuted for their religion?
Yes, hundreds.

5219. What reason have you to say so?
Their own assertions, and the cases that have been brought to my knowledge from reading the newspapers, and consular reports of the persecutions that go on in Roumania, more especially.

5220. And the third reason is what?
The third reason is simply the desire to better themselves. They come over here to friends, or relations, or acquaintances who are doing well here; they come over to try and improve their position and condition. They trave fourth class, and get across the frontier in very many instances without a passport; they should have a passport by rights, but they come without passports in many instances. They have to put up with great hardships in reaching Bremen or Hamburg, and then get on board the ships and come to Hull or London.

5221. What do they do when they get here?
They are in a very fearful condition; some are without money entirely; others have a few groschen, or marks, or thalers, or roubles, just as the case may be, of which they are very soon eased by the loafers, and touts, and runners that hang about the docks for the purpose of trying to show them lodgings, or a place to rest themselves for the night. I myself have seen scores of these poor men, with their little belongings tied up in bundles, haggling in their own language with these Christian men, trying to persuade them to let them go. No; these men, when once they get hold of them, will have every penny they possess.

5222. How do they get taught their trade?

Well,

Well, they then divide themselves up into four, or five, or six various classes; there are those who get a start by going to friends, or by assistance of the Jews, who are very liberal in their contributions towards these people. The fact is, it is a common thing on Sundays to see two or three men going round with a pocket-handkerchief trying to get up money to start a poor Jew who has just come over here in this position, that he may be independent of his friends here. There are a certain class who start as merchants on their own responsibility; they buy a little glass and try and go out mending windows if they can. Others, again, will try and get a little money and buy a box and get some cheap jewellery in Hounsditch and go pedlaring, and those, I may say, are in my opinion the men who mostly settle down and become respectable English citizens in time. The idea of travelling seems to brighten up their ideas, and they go to Hull, and Liverpool, and Manchester, and get even as far north as Glasgow, and settle down; in time become shopkeepers, and then develope into respectable members of society.

5223. And they do better than the men who go into the various trades?
Yes, there is much more scope for them in that way. Others again are thrown entirely into the poor labour market, and there is only one thing for them to do, either to starve or to work. Starve they will not; work is very very difficult for them to get. Now the sweating system, as I take it, at the present moment is the system by which the middleman, the man who is intermediary between the labour on the one side and the capital on the other, tries to get the largest amount of profit to himself with the minimum amount of labour and outlay himself, and the maximum amount of labour from those who have the misfortune to be employed under him.

5224. Have not these chamber-masters or middle-men always existed in the trade?
Yes; but in a very different condition from what they are at the present day.

5225. What is the difference?
I am only a young man, but in my experience the sweating system has undergone three distinct phases. Some 20 or 25 years ago when the labour market was not so inundated as it is at the present moment, there existed a class of sweaters or middlemen who could take out the work from the warehouses or workshops; they had nothing whatever to do with the work itself, but simply gave it out to a class of sub-contractors who would do the work for a lesser price than they were getting; they would simply take the work back again and make a handsome profit themselves. In the course of time the competition got keener, and instead of being able to take it so very easily, they were compelled to start workshops for themselves and employ people to do the work for them in order to keep up with the reduced prices that were being offered for making these articles; even that has gone now, and the prices that are being offered by the wholesale houses leave them no margin whatever; they cannot get a living themselves out of it; they have to sweat at the work as hard as the men that they employ to get a living.

5226. Can you tell us at all the sort of hours they work?
Any hours, and all hours, more especially on the Thursday night when they are anxious to get their work done ready for Friday, so as to get their money; they will work till four or five o'clock in the morning at their various trades in order to get the money.

5227. What do the workmen earn, do you suppose?
It varied according to their skill; they may earn from 10 *s.* to 12 *s.* a week.

5228. The men?
The men. It varies from 10 *s.* to 15 *s.* a week when they first start; when they get into work then they earn more. They can live on a cup of coffee and a red herring; that lasts them all day.

5229. Do men and women work together?
Yes.

5230. Do women work these long hours too?
Not so long, only on the Thursday night, when there is work to be got ready which has to go into the shop on Friday.

5231. How is the work divided if men and women work at the same time?
The women do the sewing and the men do the stretching the skins and the nailing.

5231. Do Jews and Gentiles work together?
No. They could not understand each others' language. There is no real animosity by the Jew against the Gentile, but it is because they cannot get on with their work. A German or Pole would have to ask for anything he wants in his own language, and a Christian man would not understand it; and the masters themselves, in a great many instances, are foreigners, and have to speak to the men in the same language.

5232. Do you employ Jews and Christians yourself?
Yes.

5233. Working together?
Yes, I have a Jewish foreman, and we have 30 or 40, both Jeweses and Christian women, working on the premises.

5234. With regard to these immigrants, do they get any support from any society or association?
They have support when they ask for it, when they are compelled to get it. But the last witness made an assertion that he thought there was a combination for bringing these men over here, That is quite a mistake; to my knowledge the reverse is the fact. There is nothing to bring them over here but their own free will, and persecution, and the idea of getting away from their soldiering and bettering themselves. But, as far as the Jewish board of guardians is concerned, they only try to help them when they are in great distress, and they persuade them to write over to their friends to tell them of the hardships they have endured in coming over here, and try to persuade them not to come. They have sent circular letters round to all the various towns from which these Jews mostly emanate, asking them not to send any more over. They cannot do any more than that; but when once they are here they cannot let them starve.

5235. Are you a member of the Jewish board of guardians?
Yes, I am a subscriber, and have been for years; but if I thought they wanted to encourage these immigrants coming here I should cease my subscription to-morrow; so would a great many more.

5236. What you chiefly complain of is, not the existence of these chamber-masters, but the condition under which the work is carried on?
Most decidedly; we must have chamber-masters.

5237. They are necessary, you think?
Certainly. I do not object to men taking work out at a reasonable price, and paying a man having a respectable room a respectable amount for his labour.

5238. You heard what the last witness said about the unsanitary and demoralising conditions under which the work is carried on?
I quite agree with all that.

5239. In your experience, have the circumstances of your trade become worse in the last few years?
Most decidedly. When I say that I mean through the cheap class of work; the work that is mostly affected by the system that we are inquiring into to-day.

5240. What do you attribute that to?
The influx of foreign adult labour.

5241. Do you consider that influx of foreign pauper labour to be the main cause of the evils that are complained of?
It has brought down the prices so considerably. You see there is very little capital

capital wanted for a man to start as a chamber-master on his own responsibility; all he requires, as a rule, is a board and a few nails, and then he can go out and oppose everybody that has been in it all their lifetime Some 10 or 12 years ago I paid 10 *s.* and 12 *s.* for making a dozen common fur capes, which I can to-day get done at 4 *s.*, or at any price I like to offer for the making of them. Only this morning before I came out I had a poor Jew who kissed my hand when I promised him some work for next week.

5242. Is there any combination amongst the workmen in your trade?
I am afraid not.

5243. No association of any kind?
I am afraid not.

5244. Can you suggest anything in the way of a remedy for the evils which now exist?
I suggest that the Sanitary and Factory Acts be carried out in a better way then they are at the present time.

5245. Can you suggest anything in the way of stopping or checking the immigration?
I have thought that matter over very seriously. You see we are supposed to be in a free country; we emancipated the slaves, the black men; we always used to pride ourselves that when a black man set his foot upon English soil he was free. I do not see how we can stop the white slaves.

5246. Then nothing ought to be done in that way, you think?
Yes, I think a very great deal should be done. Let us try to stop the persecution abroad if we possibly can, and you will stop the sweating system; you will do more by that means than you will by 500,000 Acts of Parliament; you never will stop the sweating system by any Act of Parliament that your Lordships can introduce.

5247. How about the wages given by these chamber-masters; how are the men in your trade paid, by piece work?
Some piece work, and some week work.

5248. And do you consider that the chamber-masters make an undne profit?
Not at all; they cannot get a living themselves scarcely now. There was a time when every man could get a living, and the chamber-masters, or as they are called in other trades sweaters (a term that I very much object to; I do not like it), could get a good living out of it, they cannot now.

5249. Do the chamber-masters put the work out from one to the other; for instance, you give an order to a chamber-master to execute an order for you, does he pass it on to others?
No, he makes it on his premises; there is no room for him to make a shilling out of it if he gives it to another man; and that trade has gone into the hands of the poor Jews, because they can do it for a much less price than what a Christian chamber-master could afford to do it for.

5250. Could you give us some more information about the religious persecution that you have spoken of; have you ever seen any order by which a man was compelled to leave his country on account of his religion?
Not exactly that; but I have heard of trumped-up charges made against the Jews of using Christian blood for Passover, which is a pack of nonsense; and even in Russia they are not allowed to carry on certain trades; Jewish scholars are not allowed to enter certain Universities; but Lord Rothschild and Mr. Stephany and Dr. Adler could give you more information on that subject than I can.

5251. Has not that always been so?
Yes; but it is worse of late years, and that is the reason the foreigners come here; they do not come here of their own free choice to work from three in the morning

morning till six the next morning, but because they are persecuted, and we will stop that if we possibly can.

5252. Is the same thing complained of in your trade as in other trades, that these excessive hours of labour are exacted because orders are put out in a very capricious manner; that no orders will be given during the first half of the week, and then perhaps an order will be sent out, and have to be executed in a short time; is that the same in your trade?

That is not the case in my trade. Then with regard to registration; every workshop ought to be registered, and I would have a *pro ratâ* scale of registration; I mean that a man who only employed 10 hands or workpeople, should pay a certain amount of registration fee; a man who employed 20 should pay more; a man who employed 100 more still; and a large mill or factory owner who employed a thousand could afford to pay still more; and with the money received for the registration of these factories a larger staff of sanitary and factory inspectors could be appointed, without touching the parochial rates.

5253. Are the goods you make sold in this country or abroad?

Mostly in the home trade; I ship some abroad.

5254. Is a great deal shipped abroad?

No, not a great deal; we cannot ship to a warm climate.

5255. I mean are you in competition with foreign countries at all?

Yes, a large trade is done in Germany; goods are sent over ready-made from Germany to London in furs.

5256. If your suggestion were carried out as regards sanitation and other things, that would naturally increase the cost of production here?

That would not matter.

5257. You mean that the competition abroad is not keen enough?

No.

5258. So that there would be no danger of this country losing the trade?

No; an English firm might buy an article from a foreign manufacturer; when our season comes we want stuff quickly, and if it were ordered from abroad it would take six or eight weeks for delivery, and then the season would be over.

5259. Have you read the evidence on the tailoring trade?

I have read a great deal of the evidence given before your Lordships, and I think a lot of it is so much twaddle.

5260. As regards the tailoring and the shoe-making trade, the evils you complain of in your trade are very much the same as they complain of there?

I think so.

5261. There is nothing very special in the evils in your trade?

No; I think the state of the labour market is all round in the same condition, more especially in the East End. The tailoring trade is carried on in Whitechapel and Spitalfields especially.

5262. I do not want to ask you any questions about those trades, but whether you consider that, as a general rule, the evils affecting these trades affect yours; that there is nothing special in yours?

No, I think not.

5263. Lord *Rothschild.*] Perhaps you would not mind explaining to the Committee how the fur trade originated in this country; the majority of furs that are obtained in the world are sold wholesale here, are they not?

Yes.

5264. And being sold wholesale here, you and the other fur manufacturers established yourselves here, as you have shown, buying furs in the cheapest market?

Yes;

Yes; they are sold most extensively by the Hudson's Bay Company and Messrs. Lampson and Company.

5265. Lord *Monkswell.*] You say that the chamber-master does not sub-contract; that, if you give him an order, he makes it all on his own premises?
Yes.

5266. But some of the chamber-masters go round to the houses of various poor people offering them work, do they not?
No; the chamber-master or sweater is the man who goes to the wholesale houses and takes the work out from the wholesale houses.

5267. But they distribute it amongst the homes of the workers?
The chamber-master makes it up on his own premises.

5268. I have been to Whitechapel and seen women working, and they told me the chamber-master would give them this work in their own homes?
Those women would call for a little out-door work from the chamber-master, but that would be a very small amount; that would be in the case of a woman having a large family or young children, and, not being able to go out to work, she would take the furs home to sew in her own room, in order to have a little income to add to the family earnings.

5269. *Chairman.*] Do you buy your furs at the annual sale of the Hudson Bay Company?
Sometimes, and sometimes from the skin merchants.

5270. And are the prices of the cheaper kinds higher or lower than they were?
The cheaper kinds have gone up this last year 25 per cent.; rabbit skins have gone up 25 per cent. this last year.

5271. Lord *Clinton.*] With regard to the remedies you propose, I did not notice that you said anything about regulating the hours of adult male labour?
I am rather in a difficult position about giving advice in that matter. I do not see how you can put a stop to a man's industry. If a man wants to work and has a large family to support, can we conscientiously say, "You shall not," or "You must not"? We can do something to prevent him working at all hours of the night; we can make a regulation to prevent that.

5272. You would propose some restriction?
Some by all means.

5273. How far would you restrict the hours?
After 11 or 12 at night I would say no workshop has a right to be open at all.

5274. Could you apply that to all trades?
Yes. In the case, however, of a man working in his own room for himself, I would let him work as long as he likes. A man may kill himself, he may commit suicide, but he must not commit homicide.

5275. You would not have those private houses inspected.
Yes, the sanitary arrangements.

5276. And registered?
Yes, but no limitation as to hours.

5277. Earl of *Derby.*] If the hours in workshops were regulated, but the work a man did in his own private house was allowed to be continued as long as he pleased, would not that give the man who worked at home an unfair advantage over the man who worked in a workshop?
He would be working a longer time; he would have an opportunity of working where the other man would not; it might cause, certainly, a lot of men to work at home then instead of going out. There are all these points to be looked at; there are *pros* and *cons* in every question like that.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

15*th June* 1888.

MR. ISIDOR REUBENSON, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined as follows:

5278. *Chairman.*] ARE you a furrier?
Yes.

5279. Have you heard the evidence given by Mr. Davis?
I have.

5280. Do you agree in the main with what he has stated?
In some parts of it, not in all. I disagree with him in respect to the sweating system carried on in the East End. I know, to my knowledge, that these men are not practically chamber-masters, but simply masters that are taking orders from the same warehouses that we take from in the City, and they, instead of employing English labourers or workmen that are competent men, go to the market (as the reverend gentleman mentioned previously), and they pick out foreigners that have just come over, that have practically no knowledge at all of the trade, and they take them into their place and they promise to give them some work. Of course men, as a rule, are very glad to get a chance to get some shelter, and they employ them all the week; first they teach them the railing, which is a part of the trade that does not require much knowledge; you simply take a skin and stretch it and put some nails on the edges of the skin to keep it firm, and then you dry it; after it is dried the skin remains in the same position as it is. Of course that does not require much knowledge.

5281. Do you not put out any work to chamber-masters yourself?
Yes; but the chamber-masters, to a certain extent, are obliged to cut down the prices because the competition is so great that they are obliged to do it. I really think the market is over-flooded; there are too many working men for the requirements of the trade; and if Mr. Johnson comes to know that Mr. Robinson takes that work for such-and-such a price, he will go and say, that he will try and cut him out; and in order that he should get his work, he will offer to work at so much less.

5282. You think, in fact, that the competition is, to a certain extent, the cause of the evils that have arisen?
To a certain extent it is; but, of course, the competition would not have been so great if the sweating system had not originated in the East End first. I do not wish to give names; I can do so if asked. I know a certain man in a large way of business in Commercial-street; he employs under him I should say about 100 men; I do not mean men entirely, of course, but male and female.

5283. One hundred hands?
One hundred hands; and I should say that, taking those he has got at the present time working at his place, perhaps he pays the males from 10 *s.* to 12 *s.*, and sometimes 15 *s.* a week, and the girls perhaps he will pay from 2 *s.* 6 *d.* to 5 *s.* a week; and they work sometimes from seven in the morning till 12 o'clock at night. They are there for six, or seven, or eight months, until they get a little knowledge of the business, and then they leave him and start on their own accord, and try to better themselves; then they go to take out work from the City firms in the City.

5284. Where is your place of business?
In Carthusian-street, Aldersgate-street.

5285. What do you mean by the City firms, manufacturing firms?
Wholesale furriers in the City. Some furriers make up stocks; general trade, such as fur trimmings, and so on; and some work on orders. For instance, they make up samples, and they go into the largest wholesale houses in the City and they get orders, and then they give the skins to be worked up. Some employ hands on their own premises; but what I think is the ruination of the business is principally the sweating system carried on in the East End, because each year they teach so many new people; because if a man that comes over goes

goes to a place in the East End he will not stop there very long, but only about five or six months till he learns the business well, and then he starts on his own account.

5286. When you put out your work to one of these chamber-masters as they are called, do you exact any kind of guarantee for the value of the skins that you give him?

To a certain extent. You must know the man first. For instance, if Johnson comes in and wants to take orders from you, you ask him, "Who do you work for?" He will say that he works for Mr. Brown, say; and we send word to Mr. Brown, and ask him, "Do you think the man is trustworthy; do you know anything about him"? Of course, if he gets a good charaeter, we trust him.

5287. Is there any reason why a great deal of this work should not be done by the people in their own homes?

Many people can do the business in their homes, but a man must be a practical man to do it.

5288. Do they do it in their own homes to a large extent?

Yes.

5289. You do not agree with the last witness, that the work is generally carried on by the chamber-masters on their own premises?

I do not agree with him in all particulars. There are some chamber-masters who take out work such as trimmings; the principal part of that is the cutting of it; the chamber-master cuts it, and they are made up by dozens; and they are given out of doors to some women who cannot come out to work, and who do the work in their own homes.

5290. There have always been chamber-masters in the trade, have there not?

As far as I recollect.

5291. You could not do without them, could you?

You must have them to a certain extent, I think; or else, instead of the chamber-masters keeping the hands, we would have to keep all the hands in the City. For instance, a firm in Aldersgate-street for its orders would have to keep perhaps 200 or 300 hands; that would require six times as large warehouse rooms.

5292. You could not put out the work direct to people to do in their homes, you could not trust them?

No, you require somebody in whom you can place confidence; you may give out a week's work coming to 50 *l.*, 60 *l.*, or 100 *l.* What I should suggest is, that the Workshops Regulations ought to be strictly enforced in the East-end district. I know to my knowledge that in this trade that I know of people are working there till 12 o'clock on Thursday night, perhaps all night through.

5293. You think that the Factory Acts should be extended, in fact?

Yes, that they should be strictly enforced.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. GEORGE EDMUND HOLLAND is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

5294. *Chairman.*] You are a cabinet maker and upholsterer?

Yes.

5295. The sweating system has been variously defined before the Committee, but generally as a system of sub-contracting; is there any sub-contracting in your business?

Yes.

5296. To a great extent?

Yes, to a great extent.

5297. And has it always existed?
It has always existed, but not so badly as at the present moment.

5298. To what do you attribute its being worse now?
To the greater number of workers that there are, certainly, and to the jobs being given out to sub-contractors, who have no men and no workshops.

5299. It was alleged before the Committee the other day in the case of some Government work, in the Admiralty I think it was, that it was given out to a man who had no shop and employed no labour himself at all?
I believe that is right; I heard that at the time.

5300. I do not ask you about that particular case, but do you know of any other similar cases?
Yes, I do. There was a table which we used to make for the Office of Works, and was used largely in all the Government Offices; it was a wainscot table, five feet by three feet wide; it cost us to make 6 *l.* 4 *s.* 8 *d.*, and we sold it to the Office of Works for 7 *l.* 2 *s.*

5301. When was this?
About five years ago. Since then that same table has been made in ash; the difference in the wood being 17 *s.* 4 *d.* only, and I will give you the price of that table. It costs us absolutely 3 *l.* 17 *s.* 5 *d.* to make, and the Office of Works pay for it 3 *l.* 18 *s.* 6 *d.* That table was given to a man who had no workmen; he had no workshop; he simply had a little place like a barn where he used to keep his stock; and he got those tables made out somewhere, I do not know where. The wages that we used to pay on them were 1 *l.* 16 *s.* 2 *d.*, and I took eight of them the other day as a trial in my shop to see if I could possibly do them. A man took them at piece-work at 1 *l.* 3 *s.*, and I, as you see, made 1 *s.* 1 *d.* on each table for the firm.

5302. You do not know where the order was executed?
I know where it was given; it was given to a little man in Stanhope-street, Tottenham Court-road, and I was told that the tables were there; and why I am so certain about it is that I went up and saw them there; and Mr. Small, one of the Post Office officials, came down to me and said that he liked the price but he did not like the work, and would I try what I could do with eight of them; and that is why I took the eight, and I put them up at a cost of 3 *l.* 17 *s.* 5 *d.*, and I got paid 3 *l.* 18 *s.* 6 *d.* for them.

5303. How has the price become so much less?
Because it has all been sweated down.

5304. Has not the cost of the material very much diminished?
The difference of the materials in that table was 1 *l.* 2 *s.* 10 *d.*, the difference of the wood being 17 *s.* 4 *d.*, and they had no castors on them, which makes a further difference of 5 *s.* 6 *d.*

5305. When you say that they have been so much "sweated down," what do you mean exactly?
Simply that they have been given to men who have no workmen, and they have been sub-let again.

5306. The result of that being that the Government get these articles cheaper?
Considerably cheaper.

5307. And are they as good as the articles they had before?
No, certainly not so good. There are chairs in the Treasury which I saw yesterday which bear the stamp of William IV. on them; you will not find chairs stand like that now.

5308. Can you give the Committee any other examples of a similar kind?
Yes. There was a telegraph birch chair which we used to make hundreds of for the telegraph branch of the General Post Office. The cost of those was 18 *s.* 4 *d.*, and we sold them to the Post Office for 20 *s.* 6 *d.* The wages we paid the men to make these chairs were 8 *s.* a chair. Last year there was an estimate

mate out for the same chairs, and I was told by the Office that they would have to be considerably cut down. I went to our workmen and told them what had been told me, and the men put their wages, instead of 8 *s.*, down to 3 *s.*; they offered to do them for 3 *s.* a chair. They cost me 10 *s.*; I put an estimate in for those chairs for 10 *s.* 9 *d.*, and the tender was not accepted because there was a lower one.

5309. You say the men put their wages down from 8 *s.* to 3 *s.*?
Yes. I promised to do a certain part by machinery, to shape the seat by machinery; but even the machine and the men's wages, the two costs combined, did not come to the same amount as the wages alone did before.

5310. You used the same material in making this article as formerly?
Yes; I reduced the price of the wood from 3 *s.* 10 *d.* to 2 *s.* 6 *d.*, using the same wood.

5311. Do you mean that it cost you less when you say you "reduced" it?
No; I simply put it down at considerably less than we had been putting it down at before. I wanted to get the job for the men; there were 200 of the chairs to be supplied, and I wanted to get the job.

5312. Can you give us the relative proportion of the material and the work in these things?
In the old price the wages were 8 *s.*; in the new they were 3 *s.*; the wood was 3 *s.* 10 *d.* in the old, and in the new one (which was not accepted) it was 2 *s.* 6 *d.*; in the old one, the sawing (the machinery, we will say) was 9 *d.*, and in the new one, 2 *s.* 7½ *d.* I paid for polishing, at the old price, 1 *s.* 4 *d.*; I paid 9 *d.* under the new price; and then there is the matter of machine and shaping in the old one, which came to 1 *s.* 9 *d.*, and sundries, such as glue glass-paper, wear and tear of the machinery and so forth, which came to 1 *s.*, and I reduced the sundries in the last one to 1½ *d.* Of course I had to bear the loss of that; it was no loss on any of the men.

5313. You do not know what the price was of the tender that was accepted?
No, I could not tell you; I know I was not lowest or I should have got it.

5314. Do you suppose if you had chosen to make a lower tender and put it out you could have got the article made?
Yes, I could have got it made.

5315. And as well made?
No, certainly not; nothing like it.

5316. The workmanship would not have been so good, I understand you?
Certainly not.

5317. Your contention would be that the Government get an inferior article?
Certainly. You do not think they get the same article when they pay 38 *s.* as when they pay 23 *s.* I will show you an instance in this room to which those figures apply. Take these stuffed back chairs; we used to get paid 1 *l.* 18 *s.* for re-stuffing and re-covering those, and now the price is cut down to 23 *s.* You do not imagine that the Government get the same thing; I know they do not.

5318. Do you put out any work?
No, we do all our work at the place.

5319. On your own premises?
On our own premises, in our factory. We used to pay a man for doing one of these chairs, 5 *s.* 9 *d.*, now we only pay him 4 *s.* 3 *d.*; the woman's work on it we used to pay her 1 *s.* for, now 6 *d.*; the leather used to cost us 12 *s.*, now it costs us 7 *s.* 6 *d.*; stamping Crown, &c. on the back used to cost 2 *s.*, now it is cut down to 1 *s.*; formerly there were heavy brass rails put on which cost 3 *s.*, now the rails are of inferior quality and cost 1 *s.* 8 *d.*; then the wool and the buttons in the seats used to cost 8 *d.*, they are knocked down now to 6 *d.* Then it was an understood thing that we were always to put half-a-pound of hair in it; we used the best hair which costs about 2 *s.* per pound, that was 1 *s.* for the half-pound, now six-pennyworth of hair is put into each chair.

5320. That is not real hair at all, I suppose; is it real hair?
Yes, it is good hair. Then we used to put three yards of gimp on them at 10 *d.* per yard, that would be 2 *s.* 6 *d.*; now we have to put a banding and gauze on, which amounts to 1 *s.* That chair used to cost us altogether 34 *s.* 8 *d.*, and we used to charge it to the Office of Works at 38 *s.*; now the price it costs us is 1 *l.* 0 *s.* 1 *d.*, and we charge the Office of Works 23 *s.* That is the House of Lords' pattern; and the House of Commons in green leather. And these chairs (*pointing to another chair*) are equally knocked down in the same way. We used to get 18 *s.* for stuffing a chair like that; now 14 *s.* 6 *d.*; it costs us 13 *s.*

5321. How long has this sub-contracting existed in your trade?
I suppose it has gone on to any great extent for about five years.

5322. Is it due to the desire to get things cheap?
I think that is the cause, the desire to get things cheap; and that has spread to the Office of Works, no doubt about it.

5323. The Office of Works naturally tries to get articles as cheaply as it can?
Yes; but it does not get them as good

5324. You mean that in reality they are not cheaper?
Take these skins in these chairs; when we used to have the high price for them we had to pay 12 *s.* for the skins; they were real moroccos, properly tanned and properly cured; now the morocco leather which the Government get is what is called German morocco; they are tanned by acids, and do not stand half the time.

5325. But before the sub-contracting arose I suppose there might have been considerable competition?
There used to be very considerable competition. We furnished a number of offices some years ago, and we were put into competition with three people then.

5326. But the competition was not so severe as to result in the employment of this inferior material?
No, it was not; the materials were good; no inferior materials used to be used. I can remember the time, when I went first into business, when nobody in the West End thought of using any inferior materials.

5327. You mean that the large houses in those days would not have used inferior materials; they would either take an order at the price at which they could have taken it using good material, or they would not take it at all?
Yes.

5328. But now under sub-contracting orders will be executed, using a very inferior material, and at a very low price?
Yes; if you want to keep your place going you must take everything you can get; that is what the English of it is.

5329. Earl of *Derby*.] I understand your complaint to be that the work is worse done, because the public insists on cheapness?
It is so.

5330. But I do not understand what is the connection between that and the practice of sub-letting; perhaps you will explain it?
If you sub-let a thing you can get your work much cheaper done than in your own place.

5331. But if you sub-let a thing, I presume one additional person has to get a profit out of it?
Yes.

5332. You must get your profit, and the person to whom you sub-let, he must get his, and the workman has to be paid?
But that tends to lower the wages of the workmen very considerably.

5333. But

5333. But how has that sub-letting arisen, in consequence of the demand for cheapness; I do not see the connection between the two things?
If you go into the East End of London, among the cabinet makers, there you will find (I do not know how on earth they do it) things are there which I could not produce for the price in the West End. Now, as an example that I can give you, I have got a dinner-waggon in my own place, that I bought the other day for 2 *l.* 12 *s.* 6 *d.*, I cannot make it in my own place under about 3 *l.* 3 *s.*

5334. *Chairman.*] Do you mean that it is identical with what you make?
No.

5335. Earl of *Derby.*] It is inferior in quality?
It is inferior in quality, and it suits the public at the present time.

5336. Then as I understand you, it comes to this, that the respectable firms would not have undertaken to produce these cheap articles of inferior quality; but that where the public require such articles from them, they find it more convenient to buy them, as they can, from persons who have no such scruples?
That is so.

5337. Lord *Clinton.*] Did you make these chairs in this Committee-room?
I could tell you if I had them ripped open.

5338. You do not know how they have been made?
My firm and Gillows had the contracts of furnishing the Houses when the Houses were built.

5939. Where would the inferiority show itself first?
In the leather.

5340. Will it require stuffing again sooner?
Certainly, the leather will not wear as long, as, instead of being properly tanned, and properly finished, the leather is tanned by acids, and they go in the trade by the names of German moroccos.

5341. Are these chairs properly put together?
Yes, they are.

5342. They are firm?
Yes.

5343. But the inferiority will show itself sooner in the leather, and the stuffing.
Yes.

5344. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Is it not almost impossible to get leather tanned in the old way?
No, I could get sound skins to-morrow if I wanted.

5345. Tanned in the old way?
Yes, tanned in the old way.

5346. Lord *Monkswell.*] And is it worth while to pay the extra money for that?
Certainly.

5347. *Chairman.*] Have you anything more you wish to say?
No, I have not.

5348. Is there any suggestion that you desire to make?
There is one thing I should like to mention, though perhaps it hardly bears on the sweating system. I should like to mention that I do not think the public offices ought to be furnished with furniture which they have got from abroad. The bent wood chairs, such as we get from Austria for instance, are ordered direct by the Office of Works from the maker in Austria; nobody else gets a penny out of them. I do not blame the Government for that; but I think that in a place like this, made with public money, if they do want to furnish it, they ought to do it with furniture made by the British workman.

5349 Then those chairs are not made here?
We have not the wood; we require long straight pieces to do it. When you buy a chair for 7 *s.* 6 *d.* it is what you call rubbish after all; it goes to pieces in two or three years.

5350. Foreign furniture competes with English-made furniture?
Yes, foreign furniture of all kinds competes very much with English furniture.

5351. Lord *Clinton.*] Where is the bent wood chair used?
There are some in this building; I cannot tell you where; I have seen them in the Government offices.

5352. Are they wooden chairs without any stuffing?
Yes, some of them have a cane seat and some a wooden seat; and I understand that the Civil servants complain very bitterly about this; that they used to have proper chairs to sit on, and now they do not.

5353. *Chairman.*] May I ask how you arrange the price you pay your men; what you used to pay 8 *s.* for, you said just now you got down to 3 *s.*; how is the price arranged?
I got the chair in a shop and sent my pattern, and I went down and saw the men, and I told them that I must make them very considerably cheaper; I said, "If you can make them, I will put them in at such price that we can get the order," and they took their money down from 8 *s.* to 3 *s.*, and it cut my profit down from 1 *s.* 6 *d.* to a 1 *d.*

5354. In your ordinary business, I mean how do you arrange the price that you pay your men?
We work by the piece; we have a regular list.

5355. How do you mean "a regular list"?
If I wanted to have that chair (*pointing to a chair*), we have all the moulds of that chair in our shop, and it is an understood thing that the men get so much for making it; if I want that chair (*pointing to another*) made, I have the molds in the shop still, and the men get so much.

5356. You have a price for every description of chair, in short?
Yes, and for every pattern, and the men know it.

5357. That is generally understood, so that it is not necessary to make an arrangement or bargain with a man?
No, except in regard to these special things where we have to lower the price as in the case I have mentioned.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Tuesday next, Twelve o'clock.

Die Martis, 19° *Junii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of DERBY.
Earl of ONSLOW.
Viscount GORDON (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord CLINTON.
Lord CLIFFORD of CHUDLEIGH.
Lord FOXFORD (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord MONKSWELL.

LORD KENRY (EARL OF DUNRAVEN AND MOUNT-EARL), IN THE CHAIR.

MR. LIONEL LINDO ALEXANDER, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined as follows:

5358. *Chairman.*] You are the honorary Secretary of the Jewish Board of Guardians?
I am.

5359. At the first meeting of the Committee, Mr. Stephany in giving evidence explained to the Committee the general constitution of the Jewish Board of Guardians and its method of working; are you acquainted with the evidence he gave on that subject?
I am; I have read it through.

5360. And do you agree generally with the statements he then made?
I think I may say in their entirety I do.

5361. You are connected also with the Jewish Working Men's Club?
I have been intimately connected with that institution for many years past.

5362. Is it any way connected with the Board of Guardians?
Not in any way. It is a self-supporting institution.

5363. And you are thoroughly well acquainted with the general condition of the Jewish population in London, and especially in the East End?
I am.

5364. And your evidence will be devoted exclusively to the condition of the Jewish population?
Precisely. I have prepared a memorandum which I have here, perhaps you would permit me to say; and perhaps it might save the time of the Committee if I were permitted to read as much of it as you would allow. I have taken very great pains to be as concise as possible in drawing it up, in order to keep well within what I believe to be the confines of this inquiry; and if I am permitted I will read it. I have drawn it up myself absolutely without consultation with anybody else, and therefore it is purely and solely my own evidence; nor have I even shown it to anybody else. I think it would be perhaps a convenient way, if your Lordships desire it, that I should read this and that you should stop me where you desire to do so, to question me on any points that may arise.

5365. *Chairman.*] Will you give us the statement you have prepared?
The first few lines will be simply an answer to the questions you have just

put to me, but I will read them again if you will permit. I have for many years past been brought very much in contact with workpeople at the East End of London. I am intimately acquainted with the conditions of the classes known as sweaters, and sweatees respectively, having learnt much of the inner life of the former class in my capacity of one of the foremost administrators of the Jewish Working Men's Club, through which thousands of workpeople have passed during my connection therewith; and I have had an extraordinary opportunity of ascertaining the state of the latter class, the sweatees, in my official capacity of honorary secretary to the Board of Guardians for the relief of the Jewish poor. My experience has naturally been almost exclusively confined to the knowledge of these classes within the Jewish community, and my evidence, therefore, will be limited to reference only within that sphere. It is with the clothing, boot and shoe making, and cabinet making trades that I desire my remarks to be connected. What is called the sweating system I conceive to consist of an organised method by which the vendor of goods, in lieu of himself being the manufacturer, obtains their production by contracting with middlemen or sweaters for their supply, the material upon which to work being found generally by the vendor, but sometimes by the sweater. The latter in turn engages the labour on as advantageous terms as possible to himself. The development of this system of production has caused to grow up a far greater sub-division of labour than previously existed; so that in some trades it is rather exceptional to find a man or woman competent to produce an article complete from the raw material, the rule being to concentrate individuals on separate portions of the work. I believe this system, which apparently is not different from that employed in the production of a steam engine, or a bank note, or thousands of other articles, to be conducive to cheap production, as requiring the employment of workpeople of less intelligence, and likewise to tend to quicken production. A double economy is thus, I think, effected. Comparing the conditions of those working in merchants' factories and those working in the sweaters' workshops, I have been unable to note any marked distinction between the two classes, and I unhesitatingly believe that the general condition of the sweater resembles far more that of the foreman of the factory than the position of middleman, as understood in general commerce. The sweater, in a vast majority of cases, is the one man in the workshop who can and does perform each and every branch of the trade; and he, in his dual capacity of supervisor and workman, does work almost, if not quite, as hard as those whom he employs. The wages of the workpeople differ little as between merchant's factory and sweater's workshop, and the earnings from daily engagements and piece-work respectively are very much the same. There is an inclination to apply the term "skilled labour" only to those workers who are competent to perform several portions of the entire work: this I deem to be unfair, as the concentration on a particular portion appears to me to provide hands for that particular portion, even more technically skilled than when the efforts of the workers are spread over the accomplishment of numerous portions; and recognition of skill is decidedly to be found in the regulation of wages for piecework, wherein the ability of good production is the guide which fixes the remuneration. The range of wages (without giving, what I do not feel justified in giving, my knowledge not having been sufficient, the average) I take to be as follows: For men, a few who are very green at the trades, 2 *s.* 6 *d.* per day, but the general wage is from 4 *s.* to 10 *s.* 6 *d.* per day. For women, from very small amounts up to 15 *s.* a week, and for girls (which is unskilled labour) about up to 7 *s.*, or even in some cases up to 10 *s.* per week. The hours of labour I believe to be on an average 12 to 14 per day. I believe the average days throughout the year which an ordinary workman is engaged would be 2¾ days in the week, but the better class of workmen would probably be engaged four days a week all the year round on an average. Tea and coffee is given by the sweaters for breakfast and tea. I observe an economy of time, and a considerable lessening of exertion, to those who work for sweaters, in consequence of the sweaters' workshops being generally much nearer to the homes of the workpeople than are the factories of the merchants. I believe the sweater, or middleman, to be an essential personage in

in the economy of production of garments in particular. The merchant tailor has not always alike the trade sufficient to keep on in a factory of his own so many hands as he frequently can well employ in times of pressure, and accordingly cannot afford to provide very extensive premises to be kept up at all times independently of whether he is employing workpeople to occupy them. And, again, inasmuch as slackness in trade to one merchant may simply mean that a corresponding briskness is attending his competitor, who has been more fortunate in obtaining the business for which they both contended, the sweater is equally useful to either, being able to contract with whichever happens at the time to have orders at his disposal. Amongst the Jews, domestic workshops exist in considerable numbers, but the Jews more generally work in the workshops provided by the sweaters. I am of opinion that the introduction of foreign labour into the clothing and boot trades has caused the output of work which the British-born would scarcely have produced, and that, therefore, an industry has been nursed which otherwise might not have been existent here, at least in anything like the same proportions. I do not wish to be thought to imply that the work produced by the foreigners is of an undesirable description, and not worthy of the Englishman's toil, but simply that, with a disposition to be content with a lower wage, the foreigners have been enabled to give their services at a rate which has permitted the building up of the cheap boot and clothing trades now carried on in London in such gigantic proportions. The sobriety of the foreigners, that is to say, the Jewish immigrant foreigner, is, I think, the chief cause of his willingness and ability to accept lower wages, and thereon to obtain no less comfort than the Englishman procures at a greater outlay. The foreign Jewish immigrant is extremely thrifty, and very industrious. I believe that the cheap production has indirectly benefited the working classes, by placing within their reach articles the purchase of which by them was prohibited formerly by the higher prices; and when viewing that the raw material which is worked upon is of English manufacture, and therefore a means of large employment of labour, and that the wages (and those of the East End tailors alone are estimated by Mr. Lakeman as 1,000,000 *l.* per annum) are spent here, it seems essential to use every effort to preserve the industry here, and not by any artificial regulations to risk driving it abroad. I would call attention to the Blue Book on "The Condition of the Working Classes," presented to the House of Commons last year, wherein may be found that a thorough search in four typical parishes elicited the fact, that in those parishes only 16 per cent. of those engaged in the boot trade were foreigners; in the tailoring trade it was very much more; but it would be very unfair to estimate that the Jewish workpeople number anything like the enormous proportion in this trade that is sometimes assumed. The foreign Jews work chiefly, and even almost exclusively, at the coat-making, and they do form a very large proportion of the coatmakers in the East End; but when the general survey is taken throughout the metropolis, it must be found that the proportion of Jews amongst the foreigners so employed is considerably reduced; and still less would their numbers appear when comparing their numbers with the whole body of foreign workers in the entire tailoring trade, that is, including the trousers and waistcoats departments, in which so few Jews are employed. In contradiction to the often-asserted grievance, that foreigners easily displace English workmen, I would simply point to the statement, in the before-mentioned Blue Book, to the effect, that whereas 66 per cent. of the natives were in regular work, only 44 per cent. of the foreigners were so. There are very few Jews employed in the upholstery business. The contract system has, of course in its growth, had the effect of reducing the number of persons employed directly by the merchant; but this is amply compensated for by their employment now by the sweater. I do not believe that the consumer would be willing to be brought in closer contact with the actual manufacturer. For instance, in the cabinet-making trade, I believe that the purchaser desires to have, and is willing to pay for, the responsibility of guarantee which naturally attaches to the purveyor, who is in this case really the middleman. The long hours of labour on a few days in the week, both in the merchants' factories and in the sweaters' workshops, attended as they are with comparative idleness on the

other days of the week, can only with difficulty, and perhaps even only with danger to the trade, I think, be adjusted. The high pressure comes at the end of the week, and this is simply the result of public demand. The orders appear to be given to the sweaters without any undue delay, and quickness of production, as demanded of them, is no special choice of the merchant tailor, but simply a reflex of the demand made upon him for home consumption, or in consequence of the sailings of vessels which are to carry the articles destined for exportation. It seems probable that any attempt to regulate the hours of labour by insisting upon a maximum per day, would not have the effect of supplying work to the workers for shorter hours and for more days in the week, but would, on the other hand, rather create a greater demand for hands on those days of high pressure, and thus rather tend to increase the number of persons engaged in the trade, and thus perhaps further reduce the average wage to be earned by each. Some exaggerated statements have been made as to the numbers relieved by my Board of Guardians of those in the tailoring and boot-making trades; I should therefore like to give the figures for the last three years. They are these: the boot and shoemakers in 1887, 258; in 1886, 276; in 1885, 230. Tailors in 1887, 692; in 1886, 939; in 1885, 647. Cabinet makers in 1887, 27; in 1886, 34; in 1885, 25. The year 1886 was quite abnormal, in consequence of the distribution by us on behalf of the Mansion House Unemployed Fund.

5366. Earl of *Onslow.*] Does that include all that you relieved; do those classes, added together, make the total result?

All that we relieved in the form of actual gifts; it does not include those to whom we made loans in the loan department, but all the ordinary relief in money or kind.

5367. Were there none who knew no trade at all?

Yes, but I am now simply alluding to those particular trades to which my remarks chiefly refer.

5368. *Chairman.*] Will you give the Committee the figures of the loans granted also?

I am not in a position now to give you the trades of those to whom loans were granted; I could supply it, but I have not it here.

5369. What I mean is this: I presume that you advance money by way of loans also to members of these three trades?

I should say, without reference, not to a single worker in these trades. I should say to people engaged in these trades, but only to those carrying on businesses on their own account. We seldom or never advance money to the workers in trades by way of loan, because they have not the necessity for it. A man who requires some little capital for carrying on a business on his own account would take a loan, or be allowed a loan, from our Board, but not a journeyman worker.

5370. These figures do not include all the relief given by your board of guardians?

All ordinary relief to the workers in those particular trades.

5371. But not beyond that?

Not beyond that. I can give all the other trades if required; I picked out these three as being the three highest.

5372. Lord *Sandhurst.*] You said that these were the people whom you relieved by donations?

Yes, absolute gifts.

5373. But you mentioned gifts in kind; does that mean clothing?

No; tickets for food. In 1887 the 692 cases of tailors just mentioned only formed 21 per cent. of our ordinary cases, and the 258 bootmakers only 8 per cent. of our ordinary cases, which percentage would be very considerably reduced if calculated as part of the entire relief, namely, including that for special industrial purposes, or as loans, &c. It is a very usual employment for

Jews

Jews to be what is termed hawkers of cheap furniture. These articles they make themselves, either alone or with the help of persons employed by them, and then offer them for sale to those who act as vendors to the public. I take it that these articles, produced at the risk of non sale, and not by contract or by order, cannot be considered to be produced under what is styled the sweating system. It has been stated as an opinion that moral degradation has been the outcome of the low wages which are the limit which Jewish girls can earn; and it has been stated that the social evil has of late years been much on the increase amongst this class. I personally am utterly unable to trace that such has been the case. The Jewish Working Men's Club is a mixed club, and I have carefully watched the status of hundreds of work-girls without being able to gather a single morsel of evidence which would lead me to such a conclusion. I have, moreover, inquired into the status of that class of work-girl beneath those who join the club, and I there find that the enormous increase in the employment of female labour, which has been the outcome of the sweating system, has enabled women and girls to earn money and help in the maintenance of the family to a degree that they were powerless to do before; and I feel sure that they avail themselves of such facility and do not in consequence drift into immorality. It may be that the Jewish community have of late years undertaken rescue work with a greater amount of activity, and have consequently sought for and been brought in contact with a condition which did not previously force itself into prominence. That the evil should absolutely not exist within the community I think can scarcely be expected; but I firmly believe that the dreaded increase in it has not taken place, and that its existence is still bounded within admirably small limits. My Board has been charged with aiding Russian Jewish immigrants to obtain a knowledge of easily acquired branches of certain depressed trades, and thus helping them to compete with native workers. Such is not the case. My Board abstains from paying premiums for new-comers to learn branches of any trades. Such persons as are complained of arrive here very often with money enough to pay their own premiums, and even, often, to be enabled to live out of their own resources and to give their services free until they become efficient as wage-earners. My Board does all it possibly can to dissuade the Jewish poor from entering over crowded trades, and in its apprenticing department a lad is never indented to such a calling. At the end of 1887 we had 267 youths serving their apprenticeships in no less than 68 different trades, amongst whom only eight were apprenticed even to high-class tailor-cutters; and it is our practice to require that the youths should be instructed in their trades in every department of the branch to which they are apprenticed, and thus to secure for them a wide, and not a limited, knowledge of their callings. My Board has been particularly diligent in using every effort to issue warnings abroad to intending Jewish immigrants, pointing out the congested state of the labour market in this country, and the great difficulty which even skilled foreign artizans have to encounter in seeking employment here, and impressing on them that poor wanderers are utterly unable to discover here any means of support, and that therefore tramps, pedlars, and mendicants should abstain from wandering hither. These warnings have been very widely circulated in the foreign press, and I myself undertook a mission for my Board to seek the co-operation of continental Jewish communities in the task of stemming the tide of immigration. In this a very considerable success has been achieved. It is not a fact, as has been asserted, that my Board assists the emigration of English so as to make room for a foreign immigration.

5374. *Chairman.*] I do not think that has been stated here?

I was under the impression that it was stated here; it certainly has been stated very fully in the press. I do not wish to put it into the mouth of any single individual, but it is an argument which we have heard of very often. I would like to say in contradiction to that, that in 1887, of 568 cases (not individuals but cases) assisted away, only 37 were those of natives; and in 1886, out of 919 cases, only 31 cases were those of natives.

5375. Lord *Sandhurst.*] Native Jews you mean?
Yes.

5376. Lord *Monkswell.*] What does "cases" mean, families?
Yes, families; one individual may be counted as a separate case, of course.

5377. A family also is counted as one case?
A family is also counted as one case. My Board has a rule that relief should be refused to persons who have not been resident in London as long as six months, but, in order to get rid of surplus foreign labour, that rule has been ignored so far as to permit the sending back home of persons who find it impossible to procure employment here. Under this system there were 143 cases returned home last year, the cost of the entire journey having been provided from our office; and in the year 1886 no less than 627 cases in all were returned home. It may, therefore, be observed that we are entirely opposed to unwarranted immigration, and spare neither trouble nor expense in trying to check it. It is found that the sending back of persons who have wandered hither, and who have suffered whilst here, acts automatically as a warning to others not to come. The term "imported foreign Jews" has been used; I would venture to suggest that no such operation as the importation of foreign Jews exists; an immigrant is not necessarily imported; and if foreign Jews do come here by invitation, it is solely at that of their friends here who may advise them to come and seek work; and if this be the case (and I believe it is so), it is surely rather a sign of prosperity, or contentment at least, than that of misery and want. I do not believe in any wholesale importation by sweaters; I have tried to trace the existence of any such organised system, but I have not found it. My Board is very careful that its operations shall not take the form of unfairly subsidising labour. Workers are assisted with coals and food when unfortunately slack, but no measure is followed in this to educate to idleness or thriftlessness; and moreover, such aid is not given as a regular bounty, nor even on any large scale to each. There is, therefore, no permanent bolstering which could be construed as a relief to the trade. It is a very frequent occurrence that when it is observed that a man cannot gain a livelihood in a particular trade, he is taken from it and given a loan with which to commence some little business, not a handicraft, on his own account. I believe that the foreign Jews can, and do, keep themselves, aided by members of their families, on the wages I have given, working for the periods I have named; their industry and frugality enable them to do so. The insanitary condition of the workshops in which the Jewish poor are employed is of great concern to my Board, and we should view with approbation any stricter enforcement of the Public Health Acts which would tend to amend such conditions. I do not believe that the cleanliness among the Jews as a body is inferior to that of their neighbours, and I am not aware that any such deduction can properly be drawn from the mortality returns of the districts in which the Jewish working classes reside. My Board has been able to do much in procuring a better sanitary condition in the homes of our poor and working classes. Our inspector last year paid 3,987 visits to 1,315 different houses in the East End, and found defects in 858 houses; prior to the end of the year, either by direct communication with the owner, or else by the aid of the parish authority, 465 of these were entirely remedied, and 243 partially remedied. There is comparative ease experienced by our inspector in obtaining admission to the homes, the tenants being always ready to admit a friend who will bring pressure to bear on the landlord to procure for them an improved apartment, but the Board cannot obtain admission to those workshops so easily, whereat the sweater is present, and anxious to bar the way to the search for defects for the remedy of which he himself is liable. All sweaters' workshops are not alike in a bad condition, but many of them require to be much improved to make them healthy. There is very little overcrowding in sweaters' workshops in the tailoring trade, but it is greater in the bootmaking trade. There is, however, considerable overcrowding in domestic work-rooms, to which work is taken home to be done for the sweaters, and which work-rooms are not under the provisions of the Factory Acts, an evasion being too often procured by claiming that

that the persons working are simply members of the same family, whereas no relationship may actually exist. It is very frequently the case that the sanitary condition of a workshop is passable, but that the approach to it, the passages, yards, &c., of the house, are in a filthy condition, and are dangerous to health. In the course of this inquiry the word "pauper" has been used. I think it necessary to point out that this term appears to me to have been allowed to take somewhat too elastic a signification. It is the practice of my Board to abstain from considering an immigrant to be a pauper immigrant if he is able to maintain himself during the year of his arrival; and the receipt of assistance is not alone considered to warrant the branding of an individual as a pauper. We do deal with pauper cases; but when, considering the effect on the labour market which would be followed by the promulgation of regulations against pauper immigration, such as exist in the United States, the greatest care, I venture to suggest, should be taken in determining the probability of how many of the immigrants who become sweatees would thereby be prohibited entry. I am quite sure that the number would be very diminutive, and the effect on the labour market would be inappreciable. Mr. Arnold White, in his evidence, stated that he traced what he calls the evils of the sweating system as having had their origin in each trade in the year 1880, and he strove to connect this year with the increased influx of pauper Jews. In reply to this, I wish to point out that the year 1880 was peculiarly free from such influx, only 145 cases which arrived in that year having during the year presented themselves for relief by our Board. The increase in 1881 was very small, and it was not until the active persecutions in Russia in the early part of 1882 that a marked increase commenced. It is, therefore, scarcely correct to seek to connect events arising in the year 1880 as the outcome of a condition non-existent until 1882. I would now desire just to give a few figures to the Committee which I have compiled from our reports, showing the influx and efflux, so far as the knowledge of the Jewish Board of Guardians is concerned, of Jewish foreigners, from the year 1882 till the year 1887. I read these figures; but I have taken a copy of them, which I will hand in (*handing a paper to the Chairman*). From the year 1882 to the year 1886 inclusive, the arrivals which came to our knowledge numbered 6,330 cases, or 12,384 persons; the departures, that is to say, those helped away by the Board, 4,982 cases, consisting of 8,429 persons, leaving a balance in for the five years of 1,348 cases, represented by 3,955 persons, showing an average of 270 cases, or 791 persons, per annum, balance in. Taking the widest signification of the term "pauper," and considering such to be one who requires some aid soon after arrival, there were at most, to our knowledge (and it is almost certain that all in want come to my Board), 3,760 cases which arrived in the five years. But if the abnormal year of the Russian Mansion House Fund, that is to say, the year 1882, be omitted, then such so-called paupers would appear to have numbered as follows: sent away by us, 3,284 cases, being 5,642 persons; applied to us, 1,770 cases, consisting of 3,543 persons, showing an absolute balance out of 1,514 cases, consisting of 2,099 persons. These figures, I think, require no comment. Taking, then, the years 1885 and 1886, the so-called pauper cases numbered 1,029 in, of which 1,092 there were sent away, the same year as arrival, 600, leaving the balance of the year's arrivals remaining here only 429 cases, against which 1,196 other cases of foreigners were, during those two years, assisted away by us. Then, coming to last year, 1887, the arrivals which applied to my Board for relief numbered 297 cases only, which I consider to be very small. Of these, 265 were relieved, 143 being sent away again before the end of the year; only 154 cases, therefore, of last year's influx remained here after the end of the year. But if a balance be struck between the influx of 297 cases, and the sending away by my Board of 606 cases of foreigners, an exodus in the year of 309 cases is the result. These figures are given to dispel belief in any extraordinary influx of foreign poor likely to have any effect on the labour market here. I am of opinion that any raising of the price of the finished articles in the cheap clothing and boot-making trades would jeopardise the existence of these enormous industries in this country; but I think that the sweater is certainly not the one who now procures any undue share of the profit. The sweatee is paid ex-

tremely low wages; but my observation has caused me to believe that selling articles at present prices, the merchant or factor, or vendor (that is, the employer of the sweater), could afford to pay a somewhat higher rate for the labour in making up the raw material. This, perhaps, is a somewhat sweeping statement, and requires detailed inquiry to establish it, without doubt. I would venture, with your Lordships' permission, to suggest your special inquiry into this, taking some few articles, and following them closely from their production from the raw material to the ultimate purchaser, with a view of ascertaining, without doubt, as to who, if anyone, receives an undue proportion of the entire divisible profit on the finished article. I would further suggest the advisability of so re-arranging the system of inspection of workshops, as to provide ample inspection both as to sanitary measures, and over-crowding, and also in connection with the Factory Acts; and of uniting, if possible, under one authority, such of these functions as are now divided. I would advise the compulsory registration of every workshop in which more than two persons work for profit, and all so registered to be subjected to frequent inspection. It will be in the recollection of your Lordships that when our secretary, Mr. Stephany, was called before this Committee, he was desired to procure certain information as to the attendance of Jewish children in Jewish schools, and in Board schools. I sought that information by means of putting four questions to the schools which these children attend, and I have received replies, more or less perfect, from those schools. I have, in order to save your Lordships some trouble, tabulated those replies. I have here the originals which I now propose to hand over; also my tabulated statement of them. I have not drawn any conclusions from these replies. I personally could not see that there was any very useful information obtained; and one question which I put, and which I fancy your Lordships most desired to have answered, was not answered by a single school, each one saying they could not answer it at all (*handing in the papers to the Chairman*). I do not put that in as my own evidence; it is simply collected at the request of this Committee. The questions I put were these: "How many foreign children are there in the above school?" the form being headed with the particular school to which I sent it; "How many children are there in the school whose father is (or was, if dead) a foreigner?" The third question was: "Please state approximately and concisely the period that the above children have attended school, and also their ages (as being completed 'years old')?" I received, I think, fairly satisfactory answers from the bulk of the schools to those three questions, but I could not get any school to answer me the fourth, which was: "What has been the average number in this school, during each of the last 10 years, of the children of foreigners?" And then I required the return to be authenticated by the signature of some proper authority at each school.

5378. *Chairman.*] According to this return you have put into my hand, it appears that the total number of foreign-born children was 2,832; is that correct?

Yes. I cannot vouch for the accuracy of these figures at all; I only bring them up as they have been furnished to me.

5379. You hand these in?

I simply hand them in.

5380. The Rev. Mr. Billing gave some evidence before the Committee the other day on that point, of the number of Jewish children; and the schools which he mentioned were the old Castle-street School, the Settle-street School, and the Hanbury-street School; are those included by you?

I have not the Hanbury-street School here; I was not acquainted with the fact that it has a very large number. I am sure that I have the 11 largest schools here; I thought I had practically covered the ground.

5381. I will read you what Mr. Billing has said at No. 5131: "The Old Castle-street school is now almost entirely a Jewish school. There are a very large number of children in that school this morning who cannot speak a word of

of English; we have to teach them English in the first place. There are not 20 Gentiles in that school." Do you agree with that?

The return from the Old Castle-street school is "300 foreign born," approximately; they do not give the exact figures there. "1,200 English born of foreign Jewish parentage."

5382. That would mean of Jewish parentage?

Yes, probably of foreign Jewish parentage.

5383. I presume that, as a matter of fact, the English born children of Jewish parents would be able to speak English, would they not?

I should think so, certainly; they would probably have attended the infant schools here immediately they could speak.

5384. Then, in answer to Question 5132, Mr. Billing says, "There are the Jewish free school and the Jewish infant school in Bell-lane and Commercial-street. You may put down the attendance there at about 5,000"?

The exact return of the Jews' free school is, "Number of foreign born, 897; number of English born of foreign parentage, 1,962." Infant school, 213 of the former and 1,098 of the latter.

5385. According to those figures, Mr. Billing's estimate of 5,000 is considerably in excess?

That is in excess of the return of the shools, certainly.

5386. Then Mr. Billing says: "In addition to that, Old Castle-street school is a Jewish school actually now. In Settle-street school two-thirds of the children are Jewish. Hanbury-street school is now applying for Jewish teachers on account of the large number of Jews"?

With regard to the Settle-street school, the return is, 230 foreign born, and English born of foreign parentage, 486. I sought the information from the six Jewish schools, and five Board schools.

5387. Is it the case that a very large number of the Jewish children are educated at the Board schools?

Yes, very largely indeed. A very considerable proportion are in these returns.

5388. You did not give the Committee, I think, any estimate of the number of Jews in the East-end of London, as to their numbers?

I have no means of ascertaining that, it being mere conjecture. I take it that those who think fit to state a figure have really to entirely depend upon conjecture.

5389. I do not think we have had any figures mentioned before the Committee, because of the difficulty, probably, of getting at them?

Precisely.

5390. Can you suggest any better way of forming an estimate of them than by the number of children who attend the schools?

Some estimates have been made. Perhaps it is a better basis to work upon the death-rate, and the return for funerals; probably that is the basis most likely to bring proper results.

5391. Is it, in your opinion, a correct statement that latterly in Whitechapel whole streets have become inhabited by Jews, which were not inhabited by Jews a few years ago?

There are certain streets which I believe have in my recollection always been inhabited almost entirely by Jews; because they have a way of congregating together in the same street, rather than spread over the district.

5392. Yes, but we have had it in evidence that there is evidence that the Jewish population is rapidly increasing, through the fact that whole streets are becoming occupied by them which were not formerly occupied by them?

That is very likely to be the case, I think; but I submit that it does not

necessarily prove that their numbers increase because a particular district happens to receive larger numbers.

5393. You mean that they migrate to Spitalfields from other parts of London?

Yes, certainly; or even from adjoining parishes, not necessrrily from distant parts of London.

5394. I see that Mr. Billing, in answer to Question 5103, says that he supposes the Jewish population in his parish, that is, the parish of Christchurch, commonly known as Spitalfields, to be about 12,000; do you think that that would be an accurate estimate?

I have no means of saying.

5395. As regards these paupers, you of course have no means of ascertaining anything about them, except in so far as they come before your society for relief?

Precisely.

5396. Do you know if there are any other societies or associations which give them relief?

I believe there is a shelter in Leman-street, an institution to which I have never been, which affords shelter to people on entering into London if they are in a condition of want.

5397. You know nothing about that?

I have never been in the institution in my life. It is perfectly unconnected with our Board.

5398. You have no personal knowledge of the condition of these people on their arrival, or of what becomes of them, except as so far they come before your Board?

None whatever otherwise.

5399. And they would not come before your Board, I presume, if they could possibly avoid it, unless they were in absolute destitution and in want of food?

I think it very likely that they come in the hope of getting something, although they may not be absolutely in want; I am sure they do; they come on the theory that there is no harm in asking.

5400. I see Mr. Stephany says, in answer to Question 13, "When in employment, they are always able to keep themselves without charity; the wages are sufficient, in some cases amply sufficient; so that even when on the most reduced scale they keep themselves independent of charity"?

I entirely endorse that; I have remarked that in my memorandum.

5401. Then he goes on to say: "Frequently the Jewish poor cannot get work at low wages from the sweater, as they can get no work at all, it is then that they apply to our institution"?

That is so.

5402. These figures that you gave us, I understood you to say, were pure charity; the first figures that you put in, I mean?

Yes, the absolute gifts.

5403. You do not include loans?

No; practically (I cannot say positively that there is not an isolated case) it is very unlikely that there is a single case of loan to any man who would come within the category of working for a sweater, unless it were to remove him from that condition. A man who had been a sweatee we might grant a loan to for the purpose of enabling him to commence some little business on his own account, to remove him from the class of sweatee, but not so long as he remains in that condition.

5404. Mr. Stephany, in answer to Question 2, says: "As I said before, the principal is the relief department" (he is speaking of the various departments of

of the Jewish Board of Guardians) "and our sole aim is, not to give out doles of relief, but to help people who can help themselves. If we see that a man is desirous of work, and that a few pounds will help him up, we do invariably give him that assistance"?

Yes.

5405. That seems to me somewhat contradictory to what you said; that appears to me to point to giving loans, helping people, not giving them pure gifts as a matter of charity?

I take it that Mr. Stephany meant by that, that we try in all cases when we possibly can, to give adequate relief, and not just a little relief to tide over a few days or a week, as the case may be, but, if we can remove him from a condition wherein he cannot earn his living, by giving him more substantial aid, to place him in some calling where he can earn a living for himself and family; we frequently do that, and that is what I take Mr. Stephany to mean.

5406. These other cases of relief that do not come in in this Return, what class of business do they relate to?

People who either commence business on their own account, or are in business on their own account and require a little extra capital; they have to find sureties.

5407. Those would be what are commonly known as sweaters?

No, we do not make loans to what we call sweaters. A small master tailor would probably get a loan from us, but a sweater certainly not.

5408. Not a middleman?

Not unless he was a man in some substantial sort of way, not a contract taker, not a man who worked for a factor and employed sweatees in his own workshop. We should not help that man to put up a workshop to employ sweatees.

5409. If a man came and said, "I have a little capital of my own, and I want some assistance," you would not help him?

Yes, if he showed a legitimate case; but not for the purpose of building up a sweaters' workshop, certainly not, if that is what you are directing my attention to.

5410. But I do not understand from you that you have any objection to the existence of these sweaters; but you rather think that they are necessary to the trade?

Personally, I do think they are.

5411. I gather from what you have told us that you do not consider the system objectionable, except from its sanitary point of view?

That is its chief objection, undoubtedly.

5412. Do you think that, as a rule, the wages are fair?

I think the wages are low.

5413. But that the sweater does not absorb an unfair proportion of the profit?

Precisely; that is exactly my contention.

5414. And that the hours are not excessive?

When they become excessive it is not the fault of the sweater that they are so, and I do not believe that the people are made to work so many long hours excepting by pressure, not brought to bear by the sweater on the sweatee alone, but brought to bear by him who engages the sweater to produce the work.

5415. You think that the large houses, in fact, are more to blame than the middleman?

Certainly. The work is crowded in at the end of the week, I think, in consequence of the public demand or the sailing of ships.

5416. Perhaps you could explain that a little more fully?

There is a tendency amongst the lower classes, as well as I can understand (and I think I am right in saying this as an absolute fact), to get their new clothes home for Sundays. For instance, a man leaves it as late in the week as possible to order his garment, and then says, "I must have it home on Saturday"; he does not order it on Monday; but there is a tendency for people ordering garments for their own wear to order them on the Wednesday say, and then say, "I must have them home on Saturday"; and then pressure may come, concurrently with that other pressure in consequence of the sailing of ships, and the order is given, "I must have this by a particular hour, or by a particular day, beecause it has to be sent to the docks to be shipped abroad."

5417. These cheap boots and clothes which people wear are not made to order, are they?

A man will order, perhaps, a boot of a particular pattern, and it may not be in stock; and there may be a demand for it and a call upon the sweater to produce that particular pattern.

5418. Do you think that that would be sufficient to account for what has been alleged before the Committee, that these orders are generally in slack times put out late in the week?

I think in the aggregate it is considerable, and I have taken some pains to inquire into that quite lately.

5419. Would it not be rather a remarkable fact if the sailing of ships constantly necessitated the goods being made on a Friday night and the order was given out on the Wednesday previous?

I say that if the two pressures come concurrently it creates the very long hours; and therefore that if the demand for garments, articles for exportation, becomes accentuated at precisely the same time that there is an extra demand for home consumption, the fact of the two coming together creates the long hours of labour; that is what I wish to say.

5420. Have you an intimate knowledge of the method in which the trade is carried on by these large wholesale houses?

I have some knowledge, simply by having been brought in contact with the sweaters themselves.

5421. Do you mean that the large houses are likely to get an order for exportation, say on Thursday, which would have to be put on board the ship by the next day?

No, it would be a longer notice than that. Should the order be a very large large one, the notice would not be so short as that.

5422. What kind of length of notice would they generally have?

It is very arbitrary; in one case it might be more than in another; but I understand it is not at all an uncommon thing for a very large order which cannot be well packed into a week, to be ordered to be returned by the end of the week, with the knowledge that if it is not delivered by that time it will not be taken. It is very difficult to know exactly what the aim of the shop is in giving a late order, but the sweaters themselves, many, whom I have spoken to upon the subject, say that they do not believe that the orders are kept back for the purpose of putting pressure on. To many I have put that question direct: "Do you think that orders are kept back in order to put pressure on you at the last moment?" They say, "No, we think that the orders are given to us as rapidly as they can be given out."

5423. Does it make any difference to the sweater whether the order is given to him late or not?

No, save and except that it crowds so many orders into one day, with probable idleness to follow for a few days.

5424-5. Does that affect him?

Not financially.

5426. It

5426. It would affect his men financially, not himself?
When his men are idle he is idle; he really acts the part of a foreman in the factory; his own workshop, which is his factory. If he has no work he can employ no men, and he has nothing to do himself.

5427. The majority of these sweaters work themselves, do they?
They can do something; they are capable generally of doing all parts; but they generally do something; and it very much depends what class of sweaters they are. Some of the big men have enough to do if they simply look after their own workshop, and simply supervise, and do nothing else; but they generally have an intimate knowledge of the various portions of the work.

5428. How do they obtain a knowledge of the various sub-divisions of the trade?
They have probably gone through it themselves, been workmen.

5429. Worked at the different parts?
Yes; and the fact of their having a knowledge of the several parts has quickened their rise in the trade, and they have become sweaters on that account. A man who only knew one part of it might not so easily, or not at all, rise to be a sweater, because he would not be a good supervisor of the work.

5430. It has been alleged before the Committee that this minute sub-division of labour has been invented on purpose to make the workpeople dependent; is that your opinion?
No, I do not think so; I think it has been in order to produce a cheap article.

5431. You think it is a natural result of the demand for cheap articles?
A natural result of competition; I do.

5432. Has it the effect of making the people very dependent upon their masters?
I should not think so.

5433. Has it not this effect: that a man or woman who can only do one particular portion of the tailoring trade, if they get thrown out of work in that particular branch of the trade, cannot find any other work to do?
Yes; but the total result would be precisely the same. If there are 100 people in 10 departments, if the whole 100 people can do each of the 10 portions of the work, the result is precisely the same as if 10 can do it in each department.

5434. But I am speaking of the result to each individual worker. You said just now that the reason why some of the working men rise to the position of sweaters is that they understand the various branches of the trade?
Yes.

5435. Therefore, I gather from you that it is an advantage to understand all the branches?
Undoubtedly.

5436. And consequently it is a disadvantage to be confined to a knowledge of only one branch of the trade?
Undoubtedly.

5437. But you think that this class of labour would be properly described as skilled labour?
I think there is such a thing as skilled labour in each department; that a man who understands all the departments is not necessarily a skilled workman; because he may be able to do each, but he may do each badly or imperfectly; whereas I would much sooner term a man a skilled labourer if he was a perfect workman in one single department.

5438. In fact, one man of course is more skilful than another?
Yes.

5439. But in the ordinary acceptance of the term you would not describe the making of button-holes, or felling, or anything of that kind, as skilled labour?

There is a matter of degree in the making of button-holes; some people are more skilled than others at it, and do earn much better wages than others.

5440. In the ordinary acceptance of the term you would not describe that as skilled labour?

No, I do not consider the making of button-holes as skilled labour; certainly not.

5441. As I understand you, your society takes means to diminish the influx of foreign labour when it considers the market overstocked here?

That is so.

5442. What means do you take?

We issue warnings abroad, and we have obtained the co-operation of similar societies and Jewish congregations on the Continent, right up to the frontier of Russia, whereby they no longer provide means to forward people on to London. The people who now come, I am quite sure, come entirely with their own resources.

5443. Are there societies or associations in Russia for paying the expenses of these people?

There are congregations in the frontier towns; and benevolent people always find a channel for giving their bounty. I do not know that there are absolute associations, but there are always charitably inclined people who may collect money for that purpose, and help the people on their journeys. They have done so very largely indeed. My experience has been enormous in that matter, because almost every Russian immigrant who came here in 1882, after the great persecutions in Russia, came before me; almost every one of them.

5444. What do you mean by "persecutions"?

The active persecutions which took place in Russia in the year 1882, for alleviating the sufferings of the people, in which the Mansion House Fund was raised; about 70,000 *l.* was then raised for the relief of these people.

5445. Do you consider that persecution is one of the chief causes inducing this foreign immigration?

Direct and indirect persecution, decidedly.

5446. You think it is?

Yes; where the persecution is not active the condition is yet such as to make life so intolerable in some places that they flee from it, feeling sure that anything must be better.

5447. Is the desire to evade or escape from military service a strong motive, do you think?

About 1882, and soon after the very active persecutions, they came in great numbers. We always refused to assist such people, on the ground that we thought a man had no right to flee from the service of his country, and the only relief we did give those people was in some cases to send them back again, but now they seldom come from that cause.

5448. Do you mean that you give them money to send them home?

No; they pass through our agents' hands all the way home; they are shipped to Hamburg, and taken in hand at Hamburg by a gentleman who acts for us there, and are seen off at the railway station, and sent on to Berlin, where another gentleman undertakes the purview of them and gives them a ticket right over the Russian frontier.

5449. You mean that, if you can, you induce a man who has escaped because he did not want to serve in the army and has come over here, to go back to Russia?

We did at one time send many back in that way; we did not try to induce the

the man so much as refuse him any other relief; if he did not choose to take that he could get nothing else.

5450. Have you any idea whether they ever arrived in Russia?
I have every reason to believe that they went across the frontier; whether, having arrived there, they came back again I cannot say. I fancy a man would not start from here to go back unless he wants to go back.

5451. At any rate you are sure that he left this country?
Yes, there is no doubt about the people we cite as leaving this country, having been assisted by us; there is no doubt of them now being put in the railway carriage at Berlin for some destination on the other side of the Russian frontier.

5452. Do you send many to America?
We sent many last year to America. In all to America, Australia, and the Cape (Australia and the Cape being very few), there were 231 cases last year; 333 the previous year.

5453. These are not destitute people you send out there, I presume?
They may be destitute here; but we do not allow them to arrive in the new country in a destitute condition; we also give them something in hand in order that they may not run the risk of not being accepted at the port of entry in America; and sometimes also a draft receivable at destination; and we find that that is a very good plan when sending them far into America, sending them South or West, because they do not stop in New York, but go really to their destination.

5454. I suppose your sending them to America, or supporting them here, would depend upon the condition of the labour market, and so on?
Certainly; we do not strive to force the people away; but we consider on the merits every case that applies to be sent away.

5455. Do you know of any organisation for sending these "greeners," as they have been called over here, or for obtaining them here?
I have striven to find any organisation to bring them over here and I have failed to find it. As to the employment of them when they are here, there are recognised spots where they are to be found.

5456. Are there regular agents who look out for them and get hold of them on landing?
There are lots of people who look after these people on landing, certainly not with the idea of doing these people any good, but quite the contrary; with the idea of taking every sixpence they have left out of their pockets, and taking them to lodgings where they are practically fleeced.

5457. And at the same time they get them work to do?
They will not do anything for them until they have robbed them of every sixpence they have. I say robbed; I do not mean absolutely stealing it, but obtaining it under some wretched system.

5458. Then they will obtain them some work?
They will not look after them any more; they will probably put them in the way of finding work, but they do not take any trouble for them, I think.

5459. I wanted to find out whether from benevolence, or any other motives, there are people or societies or agents who would take charge of these immigrants on their arrival, and intercept them as it were, and prevent them coming to you for relief?
I know of no such institution or organisation; we strove very hard indeed ourselves when they were coming over in great numbers, after 1882, to be permitted to board the ships, so as to take the people then, to direct them to respectable lodgings. We tried very hard to arrange with the police on the subject, but we never could arrange it. There are these men who go in the small rowing boats to the boat in the middle of the river and get hold of them, and when they land them out of the boats, the poor people have to part with

what they have. These waterside men in the rowing boats row out to the centre of the river where the boats anchor, and they board them and then get hold of these people; they say, "All right, I will take your luggage," and they charge them first exorbitant amounts for taking them to the shore, and then when on the shore the people are perfectly ignorant; they take them to a lodging-house, and they are not allowed to go until they lose pretty well all. We did what we could to direct them to respectable lodgings, but we found we could not get a footing on the ships to advise these people; they were got hold of by these other people before we could get the chance.

5460. So that if they have brought a little money with them, they are very apt to lose it?
They are very apt to lose it before they get into work.

5461. Do they generally go to be with friends?
They always go to countrymen.

5462. You mean people who have come from the same district abroad?
Yes, and very often they try to seek out those who have come from their own towns. A man comes here, he comes from a little village or town in Russia, he soon proves his identity as an inhabitant of that village, he is housed almost immediately by a man who is probably very little better off than himself, and the crust is divided between them.

5463. And as far as we have heard before the Committee, the general course of things is, that these people arrive destitute, some of them with very little money; that they generally go to friends, or, as you say, countrymen; that they get them work or give them work; that they work for nothing but their keep for some little time, and then work for low wages, and so gradually get into better work?
That is a very reasonable description of what happens, I think, in many cases, not in all; of a certain proportion that is a very fair description, I think.

5464. But you think that the importation of cheap labour is so small compared with the other that it cannot have any very large or marked effect upon the rate of wages generally?
The importation of pauper immigrants.

5465. Would it not be a fact that even a very small number of them would have a very appreciable effect; that is to say, if you had 100 or 200 men who were willing, or were compelled by their circumstances, to work at a starvation wage, would not the mere fact of their presence and their being ready to work have a very large effect by preventing any combination among other workmen?
One hundred or 200 coming at any one moment might have a large effect, but I think they would very soon be absorbed.

5466. It would not last?
Not unless there came relays of them.

5467. Because we have had evidence to the effect that it is impossible, or difficult, for workmen to combine to help themselves, owing to this pauper immigration; that if they stand out for shorter hours or better wages they are immediately discharged, and there is no difficulty in filling up their places by these new arrivals, who are ready to work for very low wages?
That may be the case, but I would rather attribute it to the fact, that until a man has been here some length of time he does not understand, I will not say the value of, but the meaning of combination. It is very difficult to get a man to threaten that he will retire from doing work except under certain conditions, if that work means his absolute feeding, without which he cannot possibly live.

5468. It is a fact, is it not, that there is no combination among the workmen in these trades of which you have been speaking?
I believe there is no organised combination in these trades, except what one has heard of quite lately. There was a society of tailors formed who strove to do something, but what they did I cannot tell.

5469. I think

5469. I think you said that there is a rule in your society to give relief only to persons who have been resident six months in the country?
Yes.

5470. Is that generally known?
It must be very generally known amongst the poor, because we refuse several cases week after week on that ground. I pointed out in my memorandum the way in which that rule is ignored, the one reason alone for which that rule is now ignored, and that is with respect to cases which desire to return back home, cases which have come here, been unable to obtain employment, and desire to return home; we always send them quite independently of the length of time they have been here. I myself adjudicated upon a case yesterday; I think the man had only been here three days. Poor fellow, I do not know what he came for, and he did not seem to know himself; it was a sort of drifting from one place to another. I pointed out to him that he would be looked after better at home than anywhere else. He will be sent right away home to Russia, probably next Wednesday, at the cost of our Board.

5471. What becomes of those people who require relief in the first six months of their residence here; do they get relief anywhere else?
There is no special society amongst us for the purpose of providing them with relief, with the exception of the shelter to which I referred previously.

5472. I think you said that the people preferred working in workshops rather than in domestic workshops?
I do not know that it is a preference. As a matter of fact they do it; it may be a preference or it may be compulsory, I do not know which; but the system requires it, and they do it. I think it is very desirable that they should, because the workshops, bad as they are, are better than working in their own rooms where they sleep.

5473. Is it true, in your opinion, that the middle-men are tending to decrease; that is to say, that there is not so much sub-contracting as formerly?
I should not have thought that to be the case; it may be, but I should not have thought so.

5474. Mr. Stephany said, in answer to Question 7, "I think the contracting system is dying out, that most of the work is taken now from the merchant by what is termed the sweater." He explained that further to me to the Committee that it is getting more the habit of the sweaters to get their work direct through the large houses, not through the medium of a contractor?
I think that is so. I beg your pardon, I understood you to call the sweater the middleman. I think, undoubtedly, that is the case, very much so. I am very sorry I misunderstood you; I took you to apply the term "middleman" to a sweater in that instance.

5475. So that if sub-contracting is an evil, it rather tends to diminish?
There are fewer intermediate links; yes, I think that is so, decidedly.

5476. The producer is coming into closer contact with the consumer?
Certainly. My contention would rather be that the links cannot, for the sake of trade, be very well further reduced.

5477. It is true, is it not, that the Jews very rarely come upon the rates?
The returns of the parishes in which they reside prove that very clearly.

5478. It is contended that although they do not do so themselves, they are the cause of pauperism in the Gentile population, by displacing Gentile labour, and forcing them upon the rates; have you any opinion about that?
If they do displace Gentile labour to an extent to create pauperism, of course indirectly they do that, but I am not prepared to say that that is the case. I have not been into the statistics to inquire, whether there has been any increase or decrease in parochial relief to Gentiles, in parishes in which Jews reside, because I thought that outside the sphere of my inquiry.

5479. In your opinion I gather, that anything that would tend to increase the cost of production, might result in this country losing this particular trade in cheap clothing, and boots and shoes?

I do think so; but I think there is one link which receives a little bit too much of the whole profit, that not being the sweater, but the sweater's employer.

5480. But at the same time you think that something should be done in the way of improved sanitation?

I think there is room for a great deal to be done; not I fancy in the form of new legislation, so much as in the form of the compulsory carrying out of the Public Health Acts which now exist.

5481. Would not that tend to increase the cost of production?

I do not fancy so. I fancy it would strip the man who has now a little too much as his proportion of the profits. I do not mean an exorbitant amount, but an unfair proportion.

5482. You mean the landlord?

I do not think the people could be called upon to give higher rents. As a matter of fact, the people are earning smaller wages than they were some years ago, and are paying higher rents, and I do not think they could pay any higher than they are now paying.

5483. You think if the existing Acts were thoroughly carried out, and resulted in an improved sanitary condition, it would neither cause a still further reduction of wages nor result in the loss of the trade?

I do not think that either of those things would take place. I should like to point out that a small increase in the number of inspectors would, in my opinion, be useless; it wants, in my opinion, a very large increase; what one man is expected to do now is out of all reason.

5484. Earl of *Onslow.*] Which inspectors are you speaking of?

The parochial sanitary inspectors; they work very hard indeed, but they cannot do a tithe of what is requisite for thorough supervision.

5485. *Chairman.*] You think the legislation is sufficient?

I think the legislation is amply sufficient, but that the provision of inspectors is very deficient in quantity, not in quality.

5486. Do you think that the sanitary inspector should be appointed by the Government rather than by the local authorities?

I think probably the outcome of that would be that we should get more inspectors, because there is a natural inclination for the parish authorities not to spend more money than they can help. The vestrymen are dependent on the suffrages of their constituents, and they like to spend as little as possible, and if they think they can do without one inspector, and keep down the rates, they are inclined to do so. I think the tendency, if he were a Government official, would be to provide sufficient of them, because there would not be any local influence brought to bear which tends to keep down the number rather than to increase it.

5487. Earl of *Onslow.*] Although you do all that lies in your power, as I understand, to prevent Jewish immigrants from coming to this country in a destitute condition, it is widely known, is it not, on the Continent, that the Jewish Board of Guardians exists, has ample funds, and does relieve all the Jewish poverty in London?

I cannot say what is known by the wanderers hither. Our institution is certainly well known by all continental congregations and Jewish public bodies; but I fancy that it can scarcely be thought that we, as you say, relieve all poverty amongst the Jews to be found in London, because there is that six-months rule which very markedly, I think, defines what our relief is, and cuts it short at a point at which these people would probably desire to receive it.

5488. But supposing a Jew in London is absolutely destitute, and has only been here for two or three months, and does not therefore come within your rule, he must either starve or go upon the rates?

Precisely;

Precisely; he would go upon the rates; or he will either get his countrymen to assist him, or will have to conform to our condition, that is, to go back again home.

5489. Then you do not attach credence to the statement that has been made before this Committee, that these foreigners arrive without any knowledge of English except the words, "board of guardians," which they have been told to utter as soon as they land, and that will be a passport to relief?

It may be a fact that that is all the English they know; but it certainly is not a passport to relief.

5490. Now, as I understand it, your main object is, as far as possible, to forward these immigrants to their destination, if they intend passing through England to America?

Yes.

5491. But you have no means of ascertaining when they land whether they are in a condition to proceed or not?

Our experience has been that we have never had back a single individual whom we have sent to America, he or she having been returned because they were unfit persons to enter under the American regulations.

5492. No; but a number of witnesses, who have appeared either before this Committee or before the Committee of the House of Commons, stated that they left their own country to emigrate to America, that they passed through England on the way, and when they arrived in England they found themselves destitute, and could not go on to America, and therefore were obliged to remain in England; would you be in communication with those people in any way, and be able to assist them to go on with their journey?

Yes, decidedly; but I think the numbers are not very many.

5493. What steps do you take to ascertain who those people are?

We do not seek them out, but they come to us and apply for what they require; to be sent to so-and-so.

5494. If a man landed in a destitute condition in this country, and went to the Jewish board of guardians, they would find him the necessary funds to emigrate to America?

First we should have to satisfy ourselves that it was a case that would be acceptable to America; that it was a man, or a family, likely to do good to themselves there. We should adjudicate upon the question whether he was a fit and proper subject, and not give to the man simply because he asked.

5495. If you decided the contrary, would you re-patriate him?

Yes, certainly.

5496. It has been alleged that the conditions under which the Jewish population live under are very much less cleanly than those of the Christian population; but is it not the case that in your religion there are rites which have to be frequently performed, which involve constant ablutions, and from time to time the scouring out and complete cleansing of the dwellings?

I do not know that I am an expert witness as to how far it is a question of religion in the matter, but I can say that, as a matter of practice among them, in many rooms there is a cleansing which takes place before the Sabbath, say, on the Friday afternoon, amongst the Jews, which certainly does not take place in the habitations of non-Jews; I do not say that is the case in the dwellings of all Jews, but in many.

5497. Do you believe that the class of Jews you are speaking of in the East-end, the humblest class of Jews, are strict in their observance of those rites?

I think they make a practice of it to a very considerable extent; I am in the habit of going to these places. Your Lordship, probably, has been to some of them. I have very often observed myself that inside the rooms inhabited by these people

you find a degree of cleanliness, but the filth and dirt is to be found in the passages, it being no one's duty living in any of the rooms, and it being neglected by the landlord, to cleanse the approaches to these apartments.

5498. Then bearing that in mind you would wish to extend the powers of the factory inspector, which at present is confined to the actual apartments in which the work is done, to the surroundings which are now under the jurisdiction of the sanitary inspector of the local authority?

I think it would be a very wise thing to combine the two under one inspector, the appointment of whom should be quite free from the local influences.

5499. That is to say, that where the factory inspector has a power to make certain requirements in respect to a workshop, he should have this power extended over the surroundings of the workshop?

Certainly.

5500. Now you expressed approval, I think, of the provisions of the Public Health Act, but you are probably aware that the Public Health Act does not apply to the metropolis?

I did not know that.

5501. You have no complaint to make of the Acts, whatever they may be, the Sanitary Acts which do apply to the metropolis?

None, whatever; what I chiefly do complain of is that certain powers, held by the parishes, which they have, they do not make sufficient use of. I fancy the Acts are ample; certainly if not ample, very much more can be done under them than is now done.

5502. Now, it has been stated here, I think it was by Miss Porter, that the Jews in the East-end are improving in the social scale; I think she used the words, "the Jews are going up while the Gentiles are going down?"

I remember reading such a paragraph.

5503. Is that your experience also?

I should not like to assert that the Gentiles are going down, but I think that the Jews have a greater readiness in rising than those of a similar class of other faiths.

5504. That where they come into competition the Jew usually beats the Gentile?

I think he has a natural aptitude for pushing to the front.

5505. Now, when you say that you do not advance money by way of premium to learn a trade, does that cover the practice of advancing money which Mr. Stephany spoke to us about for the purchase of sewing machines?

No.

5506. You do advance money for the purchase of sewing machines, I understand?

We lend the sewing machines, but only in a very small degree now. In years gone by it used to be our practice to do so; but the borrowing of sewing machines and machines and implements of trade is now almost exclusively done direct with the shops, and they do not come to us at all. We inaugurated that system when it did not exist amongst the sewing-machine shops, and now the demand is very small indeed, as is shown by our annual reports. I can tell you to what extent we lent machines last year, 1887. "Twenty-one loans have been granted during the year for the purchase of tools;" only 21 in every trade.

5507. Are your conditions as strict as those of the regular lenders, the dealers in these machines?

Practically, they are the same. We always did this on a business basis (but making no profit out of it), so that the people should not consider that they were necessarily receiving charitable relief, simply a little aid; but that they were paying for what they had. They repay everything, but absolutely without interest.

5508. Are

5508. Are there not other Jewish institutions, I believe they are called minor synagogues, which give assistance to the poor Jews?
To the new comers, do you mean?

5509. Yes?
My knowledge of the minor synagogues would lead me to believe that they are more in the form of a friendly society than anything else, and that certainly they would not give any relief to new comers; they would have to be enrolled as regular members, and would be no better off than ordinary members of a friendly society.

5510. Then there is no truth in the allegation that they receive assistance, to the disadvantage of the rest of the population, from the minor synagogues?
In their corporate capacity I am sure the minor synagogues do not give them assistance, but individual members might do so, because the minor synagogues are chiefly constituted of members who come from abroad.

5511. With regard to the figures in Table 6 in your Report of 1886, "Classification of trades and occupations of ordinary recipients of relief," I added the figures together, and I make out that during the three years that are given there, there were 6,380 altogether, of whom 2,703 were employed in the clothing trade, or rather more than a third?
That may be the case; I have not added up the figures.

5512. I thought you had done so?
I took the tailors and the bootmakers separately; I did not add them both together.

5513. The statement has been challenged, contained in Mr. Burnett's report, I think, that 33 per cent. of the whole of those relieved by the Jewish board of guardians were employed in the clothing trade?
I think he said in the tailoring trade. I quoted it in my last annual report, and I do not think I should have quoted it incorrectly. Speaking of his report, I say: "The same report says that of the applications to the board for relief in 1886, no less than 44 per cent. belonged to the tailoring trade, which is one of those most complained of."

5514. At any rate, a very large proportion of those who apply for relief do belong to the trades in which sweating is commonly practised?
Yes; I have the actual figures.

5515. I do not know what experience you have had of the Jewish Board of Guardians and the sweating system; over how many years does your experience extend?
I have been a member of the Board, I think, for nearly 10 years, and I have been honorary secretary to the board for five years. I think I have written six annual reports.

5516. Is it within your knowledge that before the considerable influx of Jews into the East-end the coat-making trade, as it now exists, was not known; in fact, that they brought the trade in with them?
In the present form?

5517. In the present form.
I would not like to say that; they certainly developed it immensely, but I should have thought and been perfectly certain that it actually existed before, though in a very much minor degree.

5518. Do you know whether it is a fact that a Jewish-made coat is easily distinguished from a Gentile-made coat?
I did not know that.

5519. Are the Jewish women better machinists than the Gentile women; do they get higher pay?
I am not aware that they do.

5520. Have you any knowledge of what the number of Jews in the East-end is?

None whatever; I should not like to estimate it.

5521. I understood you to say that you would recommend as some amelioration of the evil, that all workshops should be registered; that might involve some difficulty in defining what is a workshop, might it not?

I suggested that the definition should be: where more than two persons work for profit.

5522. That is, whether they are of the same family or not?

I do not think that matters; I think we may have an evil with 10 of the same family working in the same room, just as much as if they were not of the same family.

5523. What is the object which you seek to attain by the registration of these places?

Supervision, inspection, and more cleanly places.

5524. Are you anxious that the workshops should be registered in which there is no sweating done; that is to say, those in which garments are made up for stock sale?

I think every workshop should be, because you would have no guarantee that sweating was not going on where you thought probably it was not.

5525. Would your object be attained equally if it was incumbent upon every clothier who gives out clothing to be made, to furnish a register of the places where that clothing is sent to be made?

Probably the same result would be attained in that way, but I should have thought the other would have been a more efficient way of getting at it.

5526. You will observe the difference; that in the one case the onus of registering would lie upon the occupier, whereas in the other it would lie upon the employer of labour?

Certainly.

5527. Do you think there would be any advantage to be gained by your proposal over the one I have suggested?

I should like to see them both, one checking the other; I think it is so important that it should exist.

5528. Have you any organisation in America to receive the Jews who are sent out by your board of guardians?

Not in immediate contact with us, excepting so far as we request; but such societies do exist, especially at Philadelphia and New York; people are there to receive them when they arrive.

5529. Then I did not clearly understand what were the obstacles which prevented your taking these people on their arrival in the ship?

Simply our inability to catch them and advise them before the "sharks" get hold of them; these people who lead them astray to lodging-houses which are kept by people who have no feeling of kindness for them, but take away what little they come with.

5530. But every ship that comes up the Thames has to be boarded for the purposes of quarantine and Customs, has she not?

Certainly; I wanted to get on board at the same time with those people, but could not get permission.

5531. Who refused permission?

A police regulation prohibits it. A great many of them first of all used to come over in the German ships; and I tried to get permission from the captains of the German lines, but they would not allow it; if the captains would allow you to board them, the police would not sanction it. The English companies, such as the General Steam Navigation Company, would willingly have permitted

permitted our official to go on board, but then I could not make any arrangement with the police.

5532. Have you any suggestion to make by which you could get the power to go on board these ships?
If we could obtain permission from the police authorities to go on board these ships to give the people advice, and nothing else (I would not suggest anything else, because if you gave them 6 *d.*, they will want more) that would meet the case.

5533. But would it be sufficient that you should have the police permission; because I understand you to say that the captains of the ships have also declined to allow you to come on board?
Of the German lines they did.

5534. You would wish a power to go on board any and every ship?
Yes, certainly; and I suggest that in order that we should give the people addresses of respectable lodging-houses where they could find accommodation.

5535. We have asked the witnesses who have suggested (and many of them have done so) the registration of workshops, whether they would impose a fee, and, if so, of what amount on the registration of workshops; have you considered that question?
I personally should think that it would be very much better not to impose any fee whatever, because there would be a tendency, if a man had to pay 2*s.* 6 *d.* only for registration, that it would deter him from registering, and there would be a danger that he would not register.

5536. Would there be any objection to the imposition of a fee sufficient to cover the expenses attendant upon the registration?
I think there would be a tendency then on the part of people not to go to the expense of registering.

5537. You would wish to see a penalty for non-compliance, I take it?
Decidedly so.

5538. Earl of *Derby.*] Can you tell us whether, in your judgment, this immigration from the Continent is tending to die out?
It was very much lessened in 1887; there has been a little bit more during the first four months of this current year, but I think that the people have been attracted by the fear that the door was going to be shut in their faces.

5539. There was very little of this immigration, I apprehend, before 1880?
There was always a degree of it, but it was within very, very reasonable proportions.

5540. It was mainly due, I apprehend, to religious persecutions, and other annoyances to which the Jews in Russia, and Poland, and Roumania were subject.
That was the great impetus.

5541. And we may take it that those annoyances, though they may not have altogether ceased, have diminished?
The active persecution has diminished, the passive persecution, I think, is little or no better; no better, I should say.

5542. Therefore, in your opinion, the inducement to come over to this country still continues?
The inducement to flee their own country and seek a haven of rest somewhere else does exist.

5543. And all the warning you can give them, that they will find the labour market already occupied here, is not sufficient to check that altogether?
Not to check all of it, but that has had a material effect in keeping people back, together with the fact that they are not helped *en route* by continental cities.

5544. You spoke of the long hours that occurred under the sweating system, and if I rightly understand you, you spoke of those as being caused by orders given at the last moment which had to be completed in great haste?
Yes.

5545. If that is the sole cause of the long hours, I presume that they are only occasional and not continuous?
It generally occurs at the end of the week; the early days in the week are generally the idle days.

5546. Then you do not think that the average of hours worked through a week is as high as one would suppose from hearing only what is done on one two days?
Precisely.

5547. You are probably well acquainted with the working class in your district; do you think that on the whole where what is known as the sweating system prevails, the wages of working men are lower than they are in other occupations?
I think they are.

5548. You think that the system has had a decided effect in lowering what would otherwise be the rate of wages?
Distinctly so.

5549. Earl of *Limerick*.] It was suggested by some witnesses that the knowledge that your Board would assist and send back persons, has been an inducement to paupers, intending immigrants, to come over; what is your opinion as regards that?
I think that every charity must necessarily be more or less attractive, but I think we diminish it as much as possible; and it is the lesser of two evils, we prefer sending back practically almost everybody who wants to go rather than allow them to come here and accumulate here; which would be a greater evil still.

5550. Do you think that the knowledge that they would be assisted, and could get back again through your assistance if they did not succeed here, has led in any appreciable extent to a larger influx into this country?
It may have, but not of necessity. But the whole numbers are comparatively so small, that it certainly has not brought a large influx.

5551. You do not think an appreciable number?
I do not think it. I have never found a man yet who owned to that; that is no reason, however, why it should not have some small effect.

5552. Lord *Sandhnrst*.] Do you think that the whereabouts of all these sweaters' shops are known?
Yes, they are known to us.

5553. You think they are all known to you?
They are known to us, because our sanitary inspector goes into every room and every street where they exist.

5554. How do these people pay their rents? Do they pay them weekly?
You mean of their domiciles?

5555. Yes?
Yes, weekly.

5556. Then would not the landlord be made responsible in some way for the cleanliness of them?
I believe there are ample powers, and that is our aim, to make the landlord responsible. Of course when we find a defect, the first thing we do is to write a letter to the landlord to say, "We have found this, that, and the other, in a house which belongs to you, and we hope that you will kindly rectify these defects at once." Some of them thank us for drawing their attention to the matter, and rectify more or less; others snap their fingers at us and say,

say, "You have no power to compel us to do it; we shall take no notice of you whatever." The result is that we apply to the parishes to place pressure on the landlords. The Whitechapel parish does a great deal in that direction; but, practically, that is work that I think should be done by the parish itself; and the pressure might be a little harder than it is. I am not speaking simply of Whitechapel (which is the best parish of all), but in some of the others they are very apathetic indeed, and even when defects are brought to their notice, they take very little trouble to bring pressure to bear upon the landlord to compel a rectification.

5557. In regard to the relief, do you give relief to the aged and infirm?
Yes, we have a considerable number of pensioners, and they are either people who are absolutely too old to work and have borne a good character throughout life, or else people suffering from some malady which incapacitates them; but all the people to whom we give regular allowances have been here, I think, without exception over seven years; a good many of them are natives, but I do not think there is a single exception to their having been here over seven years.

5558. You say these are people of good character?
Yes.

5559. In regard to people of bad character, what happens?
They would never get a regular allowance from us, without it be some very deplorable case of ill-health, or something of that sort; one might take pity on the individual. When I say "good character," I mean that they must show that they have been industrious.

5560. But your board of guardians keep them from starving, at any rate?
Practically if a man is absolutely in want of a crust we should not let him go overnight without it; but we should not do it every night. The secretary has power to give a bread-ticket value about sixpence to any individual who appears to be absolutely starving.

5561. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] With regard to overcrowding, do you think it would be possible and fair to throw the onus of preventing that upon the landlord. With regard to sanitary improvements, on his attention being called to any defect, of course he would be bound to set it right; but with regard to overcrowding, could you throw the onus upon him?
I am afraid it is not practicable, because, if a man lets a room to a person by the week, I take it that that person can, within these seven days, shut the door in the face of the landlord, and do what he likes.

5562. It would be quite impossible, would it not, for the landlord to know?
I do not think you could expect the landlord to know how many people slept in a room at night.

5563. We have been told, I do not know with what degree of accuracy, that many of the improved dwellings are empty, or only partially filled; do you think that, if you increased the sanitary requirements, those improved dwellings would be likely to be better filled?
I think they would.

5564. You think that enforcing sanitary improvement woul have the effect of driving people to them?
Yes. There is a disinclination among these people to move out of the dwellings which they have been used to live in; if you could infuse into them the habit of going into these industrial dwellings they would go like a flock of sheep, I think.

5565. Has your board any indirect connection with these improved dwellings?
None whatever; they are not eleemosynary in their character.

5566. I meant, whether members of your board are connected with the Improved Dwellings' Company?

I think they are shareholders in it, because they have taken shares in it for the purpose of benefiting the people.

5567. Not practical managers of it?
No; there may be some members of my Board who are directors of the company.

5568. But not practical managers?
No.

5569. Lord *Monkswell.*] With regard to limitation of hours of adult labour, I understand you to say that limitation of hours might lead to the employment of more persons, and that that would probably result in lower daily wages; I do not know whether that is your theory, but the working men generally contend the contrary?
I believe the more people you bring in to compete, the tendency is to lower the wage.

5570. I do not understand that. Bringing more people in to compete, I understand it, would take more people off the market; if you reduced the number of hours that each person would work, it would result in the employment of more persons who are at present in the market waiting for work; that is the idea in the minds of the working man?
That would be the effect, probably; but surely, if there is 50*s.* to be divided amongst workmen by doing a certain amount of work, and now it is done in 14 hours a day by five men, and you are going to have it done in seven hours by 10 men; that reduces it one-half.

5571. You mean because they work less hours?
Yes.

5572. That does not decrease the amount which would be paid for piece-work?
No; but it delays the earning ability.

5573. You said that extra hands would have to be put on in times of pressure; I suppose that your contention is that it would probably lead to more uncertain work. Now, if a little extra work has got to be done, the same workmen can work as long as they like to do the work; but, on the other hand, if you restrict the hours of labour, more persons would have to be brought in; and I suppose your contention would be that, in that case, the work would be more uncertain than it was before, that there would be more people looking out in the market for this stray work than at present?
I think that would be so.

5574. I do not quite understand how it is that none of the Jews go to our workhouses; I understood you to say that, as a matter of fact, none or hardly any go to our workhouses?
They do not.

5575. Why is that?
Simply, because they have an enormous dislike of going into the poor-house, as they call it; and they get assisted by their friends, who, with an equal dislike for it, would rather help them and divide the little they have themselves than allow them to go there.

5576. They would rather, it seems to me, go back to their own native country, where they are liable to serve in the army, than go into one of our workhouses?
They would sooner run the risk of discomfort at home, where they have friends, than discomfort where they have not.

5577. When you talk of assisting the people away, do you mean sending them abroad, or do you mean out of London.
I always mean, when I say that, emigrating them from the country. The number of people we remove to other parts of Great Britain in the year is very small indeed, and we never do it unless there is some absolute and special reason, such

such as to send the people to join friends, or because they have special employment, or something of that sort. We never shunt the burden from London on to the provinces.

5578. *Chairman.*] You have confined yourself to the boot and shoe-makers, tailors, and cabinet-makers; you do not wish the Committee to understand, do you, that, in your opinion, the sweating system does not extend to the other trades also?

I have not inquired into the other trades; I confined myself to those three, because I believe that it is in those three that the Jews are chiefly employed.

5579. I see, in answer to Question 7, Mr. Stephany says, in speaking of the sweating system: "It is very largely carried on in the tailoring trade; but I think your Lordships will find that it is also carried on in almost every other trade, and notably the cabinet-making trade; in that trade I believe it is carried on very largely indeed;" is that your opinion too?

I believe it is so. In the upholstery trade there are very few Jews employed.

5580. Looking at these figures which you quoted to the Committee of the numbers relieved by the Jewish Board of Guardians in 1885, 1886, and 1887, I see that the cabinet-makers are a very small percentage?

Very small.

5581. How do you account for that, if the sweating system is very prevalent in the cabinet-making trade?

There are not so many Jews in the cabinet-making as there are in the tailoring and boot-making, and those who are employed therein get on a little better in that trade than they do in the other two; I do not think the crush is quite as great.

5582. You would not deduce from that fact, would you, that the sweating system is not injurious?

No, I do not think that is a reasonable conclusion.

5583. If Mr. Stephany is correct in saying that the sweating system is notably to be found in the cabinet-making trade, and if at the same time the proportion of people engaged in the cabinet-making trade that you relieve is very small, it might at first sight appear to lead to the deduction that the sweating system was not injurious or doing any harm?

In the face of the other two trades, I do not think one could reasonably draw that conclusion.

5584. Is it the case that the Jews and Gentiles do not assimilate at all or very little.

They do as quickly as the new-comers are Anglicised; but the people who come here cannot speak the language, and they naturally therefore drift towards those who can speak the language which they themselves alone understand; but as they become Anglicised they intermingle with others. I always think that a man is thoroughly Anglicised after seven years here; very materially much sooner. The term that we apply to them after they have been here seven years is "settlers," and certainly by the time they enter that category they intermingle enormously with non-Jews.

5585. I will draw your attention to an answer of Mr. Billing the other day. In answer to Question 5075 he says, "Your Lordships should bear in mind that these Jewish immigrants are in a very peculiar position. They cannot go into ordinary employment under Gentile masters as journeymen in any way, on account of the restrictions which their religious creed imposes upon them; they cannot be put to agricultural labour not under Gentiles; there are so many times when they could not work:" is that correct?

As new-comers, until they become Anglicised, decidedly yes; but the conclusion I should draw from that would be that it therefore leaves a freer field for Gentiles.

5586. I merely wanted to know as to the fact. I do not see how a residence of

of seven years would alter the case, because what Mr. Billing says is that their religious creed imposes restrictions on them?

I should hardly say that; except, perhaps, the difficulty of not working on the Sabbath; that, no doubt, tells against them. If work has to be produced, and put out on Saturday night, and they can only work to sunset on Friday, that does tell against them. Employers might in that way give employment to a non-Jew where the Jew might otherwise obtain it.

5587. And Mr. Billing goes on to say, "There is a whole class of young people in our part who get their living by, as they say, poking fires for the Jews; that is, attending on some of those who can afford to pay them some little sum, one girl taking several families, to do what work their law forbids them to do at certain seasons; and so these poor creatures must do this work which their own co-religionists offer to them, or do nothing. They cannot fall into the ordinary labour market, and go where they please and do what they please. That is a matter which has always to be borne in mind in considering this subject."

That is a fact, certainly; it is the practice of the Jews not to kindle a fire on the Sabbath Day, and when the fires are being kept up and there are only Jews in the house, some who strictly adhere to it engage Gentiles to come in and keep the fires going on the Sabbath, to light the lights, and so forth.

5588. In your opinion, do these restrictions which their religious creed imposes upon the Jews, prevent them from obtaining work in the ordinary labour market in competition with the Gentiles, and compel them to herd together in special trades?

I do not think it keeps them in particular trades; it might affect them in a few particular trades, but it is not sufficiently severe to keep them to the two or three in which they generally trade.

5589. Earl of *Onslow.*] Miss Potter, in her evidence, in answer to Question 3331, says, "There is this point that ought to be clearly brought out, that the Jewish tailoring trade, and the Gentile tailoring trade, are in water-tight compartments, and they do not compete with each other;" do you agree with that?

To a degree, yes. The Jews are employed, perhaps, in a little different sort of work, as I said in my memorandum, from that in which the Gentiles are engaged, and in a department which, I think, the Gentiles would never have developed.

5590. *Chairman.*] You call these people "settlers" after they have been here seven years?

Yes.

5591. How long does it generally take a man before he can talk English?

Some of these fellows are very apt indeed in acquiring English. I have known a man before he has been a year in England speak it very well indeed; some of them have not the same aptitude, and take longer in acquiring the language.

5592. You would say that in two or three years' time they can make themselves understood?

Yes. When I was shipping very large numbers to America, in the year 1882 (sometimes, I think, we sent 600 or 700 a week), I procured a vocabulary with easy sentences that they might be likely to require, and gave them it to learn on board ship, writing the English in Hebrew or German characters; and I was assured afterwards that they made immense proficiency in the fortnight or three weeks that they were going across the Atlantic.

5593. We might assume that the Jews who can speak no English are new arrivals?

Not necessarily; some of them do not strive to learn English, or else they have not the knack, and are a very long time before they do. If they are brought at all into contact with non-Jews they very readily acquire it. I consider

sider that they have much greater readiness than Englishmen in acquiring a foreign language.

5594. Do you know the parish of Spitalfields very well?
Yes; at one time I visited much amongst the people there; now I visit much less, because my other duties take up so much of my time; but in contemplation of giving evidence here, and before the House of Commons Committee, I have been amongst them again in order to refresh my knowledge.

5595. The Rev. Mr. Billing, in answer to Question 5163, says as to the proportion of immigration to the natural growth of the population, "My answer to that is this, I test such statement by the fact that in a neighbourhood like ours" (that is in Spitalfields), "I find whole batches of buildings in which there are those that cannot speak a word of English;" in your experience, is that the case?
I should have thought that there was no house where you could not find somebody who could speak a little English. I have never found that myself; but I do not like to say that Mr. Billing's experience has not been otherwise.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. SOLOMON GREEN, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined as follows:

5596. *Chairman.*] WHAT is your business?
A fishmonger.

5597. Where do you carry that on?
In the Mile End-road, now.

5598. And where did you carry it on formerly?
In Goldstone-street, Whitechapel.

5599. Are you a native-born Englishman?
Yes

5600. Is your business principally carried on with the Jewish population?
It was, until I was driven out by the Polish people.

5601. Your trade is not itself, I presume, affected by what is called the sweating system?
No.

5602. But the customers, the people with whom you deal, are?
The thing that brings ruin and starvation on this country is costermongering, through the influx of foreign paupers.

5603. In what trade do you mean?
In general trade. Directly they are over here they become bakers, butchers; every possible trade you can mention.

5604. Perhaps you would explain yourself a little more fully on that point; do you mean to say that the immigration of foreign paupers has an injurious effect upon various trades?
A most injurious effect upon every trade that you can possibly mention.

5605. What makes you think so?
From experience; seeing English families who could afford to keep their families in respectability and decency, now starving, while these people are getting on.

5606. What trade do you allude to?
Every trade that you can possibly mention; competition in everything. They are tailors, they are bootmakers, cap makers; every trade you can possibly mention.

5607. Since when has this state of things taken place?
Within the last six years.

5608. Do you mean that there has been more of this immigration within the last six years?
Within the last six years it has been something fearful.

5609. Do you understand what is meant by the sweating system?
Yes, it is the labour; these people will work for a mere nothing; and if there were no sweaters they would cut out the other people. I can show you some clothing here made at 10*s.* 6 *d.* a suit and sold wholesale at 10*s.* 6 *d.*

5610. You attribute all this to what?
To the influx of the Polish and Russian Jews.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. EDWARD SIMMONS, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined as follows:

5611. *Chairman.*] You are engaged in the dress trimming trade?
Yes.

5612. Perhaps you would explain to the Committee what that is?
It consists of making fringes, tassels, ornaments, and everything appertaining to dresses and mantles.

5613. How long have you been in that business?
Thirty years.

5614. In what neighbourhood?
In the neighbourhood of Bethnal Green and Spitalfields.

5615. Is yours a ready-made business or a bespoke business?
It is mostly bespoke.

5616. Do you make for customers or for large houses?
Mostly for large houses.

5617. Just explain to the Committee the character of the trade, how you get your orders, and so on?
We get them from the City houses as a rule, because they debar you from going to West-end houses, which they claim as being their customers.

5618. The West-end house sells to the consumer, and the West-end house gets its orders from the City house; is that what you mean?
No. A lady will instruct her dressmaker to procure for her certain articles and trimmings; the dressmaker will apply to such houses as Peter Robinson's, and other large West-end houses; but they will say that they have not got them, and they in their turn will apply to the City houses, and they in their turn will apply to people in Bethnal Green, and they in their turn will give it out to be made.

5619. You coming under the category of the people in Bethnal Green?
Yes, exactly; and I was manager to a firm in the City of London. I was there over 20 years, and manager for about nine years.

5620. Do you manufacture on your own premises?
I do a little; I am only in a small way.

5621. Do you give out most of the work?
I have hands indoors, and give work out also.

5622. By giving work out, do you mean that you give it out to people who make it up in their own homes?
Exactly.

5623. Has

5623. Has your trade changed; has it always been like that, or has it changed within the last few years?
It has changed in respect of the reduction of wages to the workpeople this last few years.

5624. How do you account for that?
I attribute it to this: Because the consumer is not more in touch with the producer; that the middle people take the profit which might be given to the workpeople to increase the pay on it. For instance, a West-end draper will say to a warehouse in the City of London, "I want something at 6*s.*"; he in his turn will say to persons like myself, "We want something at 4*s.* 6*d.*"; and the next party wants it for something less; and in consequence the workperson gets simply the dross of it.

5625. Was not that always the case in the trade?
I do not think to as great an extent as now.

5626. I mean was not the trade carried on by the same means?
Yes.

5627. It is not the existence of these various contractors or middlemen that has caused the reduction in the wages to the working men?
I think it is.

5628. Let me clearly understand what you mean. If those middlemen have always existed, but you complained of a reduction of wages which has taken place in the last few years, how is it that you attribute that reduction of wages to the existence of those middlemen?
It would not be exactly to that alone; it is caused also by the foreign importation into the market, which we did not have so much of years ago.

5629. You mean importation of foreign goods?
Foreign goods.

5630. That certainly does not come within the scope of the inquiry of this Committee?
What am I to understand by the word "sweating" that is sub-contracting, is it not?

5631. It has been defined as sub-contracting.
What is the difference between that and a large city house of the City of London contracting their work out by any other system, when they say, "This is our make," and it not their make; that is what I complain of. I recommend that the Trade Marks Act should be applied. It would be a remedy against it.

5632. Do I understand you that you complain that City houses sell as their own goods goods of foreign importation?
I complain that they place up an advertisement as manufacturers, when they are not manufacturers, and they take the profits as manufacturers, and had it been known they were not manufacturers they would not have had the same profits. There is not the least doubt that if I purchase Dent's gloves I purchase them because they are Dent's gloves, and when they are not, I take that to be wrong.

5633. You think that all goods should be marked with the name of the maker of them, is that what you mean?
Certainly, why not? And then I complain too of the working of the Factory Act?

5634. In what way?
That there are not sufficient inspectors; I have evaded them myself many a time.

5635. In your present premises where you are now working, do you mean?
No, where I was employed, Messrs. Richard Evans & Company.

5636. How do you mean that you "evaded" them?
I have had those under age in the place, not exactly knowing it myself, but they

they were so; I have had an intimation that the inspector was in the neighbourhood, and I simply sent them for a walk till he was gone. We did not see him more than once in about nine or 12 months, and then everybody in the neighbourhood knew that he was in the neighbourhood; consequently we never were detected. After he was out of the neighbourhood, people went on with the work as before.

5637. Are persons under age employed in that way?
Yes, plenty are employed from 2 *s.* a week upwards.

5638. Girls?
Girls mostly; girls and boys.

5639. What do you say they earn?
From 2 *s.* a week.

5640. Up to what?
Up to about 10 *s.*

5641. And what hours do they work?
Where the Factory Act is looked after, they mostly work from nine to eight and seven to eight, and then it is evaded by giving them work home.

5642. They take work home, you mean?
They take work home.

5643. Supposing they do not choose to take work home?
It is a free option to themselves. You may sometimes say, "Unless you take this home I do not want you." I have said that myself. The firm that I was in had a turn over of from 250,000 *l.* to 300,000 *l.* per annum, and all that they spent in absolute wages to workpeople would not amount to 4,000 *l.* per annum. They have had hundreds of thousands of grosses of braids, millions, I might say, since they have been in existence, and they have never made an inch of it; in fact, they are not capable of making it.

5644. That has no bearing, has it, upon the subject of inquiry of this Committee. If you have anything more to say as to the question of inspection, sanitary inspection or factory inspection, we shall be glad to hear it?
A remedy for a lot of the low price in our work would be if the Workshop Act was properly applied; it would necessitate the people having proper space to work, and, consequently, they would get more for their work.

5645. Why would they consequently get more for their work?
Because these people who would take the work would simply say, "I cannot do it at the price."

5646. Why?
If you occupy a place at 2*s.* a week and you have a certain amount of work, you take that at the price; but if you pay 4 *s.* a week, you take it at a better price.

5647. You mean that the more rent they pay the higher wages they would get?
Yes, they would get higher wages.

5648. They would get higher wages from the mere fact that they had to pay a higher rent; it that what you say?
They would get a better class of work and also get a better price, in consequence of the place being kept clean and all the surroundings; it would lead to that; it looks like an inconsistency, perhaps, but what I mean to convey is this: that instead of their working in holes and corners, they would work in a place that they had to pay a higher rent for; consequently they would get a higher class of work and be able to pay their hands a better price for it. For instance, very cheap labour in our trade they can produce at Coventry, because you can get a house at Coventry for 4 *s.* a week; here in London we have to pay 8 *s.*, and the common work here would necessarily migrate there, and we should get the better class here.

5649. Then

5649. Then do you think it would be a good thing that what you call the commoner class of work should leave London altogether?
Yes, exactly.

5650. You think it would be a good thing?
I think it would be a good thing; the suggestion that I throw out is, that the Factory Act, the Trade Marks Act, and the Workshop Act should be more stringently looked after, which I have come to the conclusion in my mind would prevent a lot of this sweating system.

5651. What you complain of in fact is, the unsanitary conditions under which the work is carried on?
Yes, the unsanitary conditions, and also the Factory Act not being carried out as it should be.

5652. You have already stated that the Factory Act is evaded now by the employment of children?
Yes, and also that there are numbers of rooms in the lowest parts of Bethnal Green and various other parts which people work in, and the inspector knows nothing about it; and where there is a room with six or eight people working in it, it should come under inspection.

5653. The inspectors, you say, do not know of the existence of these places?
I believe not.

5654. How would you get over that difficulty?
By appointing inspectors, with the ordinary intelligence of a serjeant of police, at 50 *s.* a week, instead of a man at 600 *l.* or 700 *l.* a year, whose qualification is, that he is a mathematical scholar, and who knows nothing about the ins and outs of the East End.

5655. You think that the present inspectors are not capable of doing their duty?
They have not the knowledge.

5656. Do you think they ought to have a technical knowledge of the trade?
I think they ought to know the whole all round, the habits and customs of the trade. If, for instance, you have half-a-glass of bitter in a place where the people belonging to the trade associate, you can hear it all; Tom, Dick, and Harry will tell you all about it; but as for these inspectors we have, it is a case of "The Lord Mayor is coming," and everybody knows it.

5657. In fact you mean that the attendance of an inspector in the neighbourhood is well known throughout the neighbourhood?
Yes; once when I was manager, just as I was going out of the front, the inspector came there, and he asked, "Is the manager in," and I said, "He has just gone out," and I walked out, as it did not suit me to see him then.

5658. Is there any other suggestion that you wish to make?
No, I do not think so. I might tell you my opinion. I do not think that any course of legislation is able to cure it.

5659. You do not think that legislation can do any good?
Not a bit. I do not believe in class legislation on this point, because it is sure to be evaded.

5660. Do you mean to say that you do not think that anything beyond the existing legislation will do any good?
Yes.

5661. But you do think that existing legislation is not enforced?
Yes.

5662. And that it would be sufficient if it was enforced?
Yes. The working seasons are mostly about four months at a time, and then there is a rest of six weeks; we can often do two of those seasons before we see the inspector.

5663. Is the work pretty constant in your trade?
No; we only work by seasons.

5664. What do you call a season?
We consider we are done when Ascot and Goodwood are over, as a rule.

5665. When do you begin again after that?
About August, and do what we term the autumn trade. Now we consider we are done.

5666. How long does the autumn trade last?
It lasts till about the end of November; we generally use a saying, "When Lord Mayor's Day comes, the trimming trade is done: and when Valentine's Day comes, it commences." There is no particular rule about it; but it is about that time.

5667. Do the workpeople engaged in your trade do any other work between the seasons?
We get a little; for instance, my wife has hands, and they will make two days this week.

5668. Do they work piece work?
Some piece work and some week-work.

5669. Is the work done by men or women?
The men can only do one class, and the women one class. In the weaving a man can do it, but in making ornaments and things made for dresses, it is entirely done by female labour.

5670. And female labour is principally employed in your trade?
Principally; 75 per cent.

5671. What do they earn?
A good hand, on an average, will earn 10 *s.* a week through the year. If they get more they make it up by taking work home, and in various ways.

5672. Are the workpeople principally Christians or Jews, or both?
We have not got many Jews in ours; a few, not a great many.

5673. Not enough to affect the trade?
Lately we have had Jews come and take out work, and re-give it out; it is mostly among the Christian population. I was born in Spitalfields, and consequently I know the whole of the surroundings of it.

5674. Is there much difference in Spitalfields in your experience?
Yes. I was born there; I can date back in my recollection, and where there were then two Jews, there are 40 now, or more, 60. I know a street, which, when I was a boy, there was not a Jew in, and now it is completely full of them. My acquaintance has been mostly with English-born Jews.

5675. Earl of *Onslow.*] You paid a high complement to the Metropolitan Police Force, which I am sure they will appreciate; but I should like to know whether you think that a sergeant of police would have the necessary qualifications for telling whether a place was in a sanitary condition; whether the drains were in proper order, and whether the cubic space was sufficient for the number of people employed?
I should think so.

5676. And you think he would be a better judge of that than a man who had passed an examination in those matters and was deemed especially qualified?
I would not say a better judge. The observation I want to convey is this: that a man taken from the trimming trade would understand it practically. Suppose, for instance, I am an inspector, when I walk into the shop I know where to look for these things; but a man who comes from Manchester or other parts does it in a formal way.

5677. Do they come from other parts?

I can

I can remember Mr. Orr, I think it was coming from Manchester, an inspector.

5678. You do not mean, do you, that they sometimes go to Manchester, and sometimes to the East End of London?
No; when I said that they required men with the average intelligence of a serjeant of police, I meant men taken from the various trades which they have to go to and inspect; these men would at once know where to look for a thing, the same as a scholar would know how to go and consult books.

5679. Do I understand that you would recommend that in each trade a factory inspector should be appointed from that trade?
As near as possible; not a man at 600 *l.* a year; say a man at 125 *l.* or 150 *l.*

5680. Would not that involve the appointment of a very large number of inspectors?
I think not.

5681. Then your complaint is not against the number of inspectors, but against their qualifications for the post?
I do not understand you.

5682. You do not complain that there are too few inspectors?
I complain that there are too few, which might be counteracted by employing people at less salaries than the inspectors at the present time receive.

5683. Now, if the cheap work were driven out of London, what would become of all those people who are now employed in London upon the cheap work?
They would get on to a better class of trade; they would be educated up to what is done in Paris and Berlin.

5684. You think that, instead of driving trade out of London, it would have the effect of bringing trade to London?
Exactly.

5685. I suppose your observations are confined to your own trade?
Exactly. I know about other trades; but I would sooner confine myself to my trade, to which my knowledge extends. I have a considerable experience of the East of London.

5686. Then you said that if the workshops were in a better sanitary condition, and, as I understood you to say, if the rents were higher, there would be a better class of work, because the masters would be more willing to put it out to such places?
Yes, instead of sending it to Paris.

5687. Is it your experience that the master makes inquiries as to what is the character of the place where the work is done?
I believe they make none whatever. I used to go by the appearance of the individual I was looking at.

5688. What led you to say, then, that the masters would be more willing to put work out to such places?
I think that if the thing was in a better position, they would be in a condition to give them better work; they would not take the common work.

5689. I cannot quite follow the line of argument; do you say that they would not be able to take a low class of work?
They would not be able to take a low class of work.

5690. They would not be able to afford to do it?
They would not be able to afford to do it.

5691. And then it would be driven out?
Yes.

5692. Do you say that the masters do not give out the work which now goes to Paris because they are aware that the workshops here are in an unsanitary condition?

In some cases, I would not say all; it has a tendency that way.

5693. It is not, you think, that they can get it done cheaper in Paris; that has nothing to do with it?

No; it is dearer. In my experience they say about things they want done, "It is no use sending them to Bethnal Green; we will send them to Paris."

5694. Nor has it anything to do with the possible fact that French workers are more skilled and more artistic than the English workers?

They are more artistic than the English are.

5695. Then do you think that if the unartistic English workers lived in sanitary places in England, they would be able to compete successfully with artistic workers in Paris?

It would have a tendency to that. I cannot say how their abilities would turn out.

5696. Did I understand you to say that you wished to have the Trade Marks Act (by which you mean, I suppose, the Merchandise Marks Act) applied?

Yes.

5697. I do not understand exactly how you would do that, because the Merchandise Marks Act requires that all goods should be marked with the place of origin; would you have them marked with the name of the place of origin or the name of the maker?

The name of the maker; that is, that if I buy a watch and go to Dent's, and they say, "This is our make," it should be their make.

5698. Supposing he says, "It is not my make, but I guarantee it"?

Then I should be in possession of that fact.

5699. That would be sufficient for your purpose?

Quite sufficient.

5700. Supposing a West End house was to sell a mantle which was made in Bethnal Green, if they said "We guarantee it," that would be sufficient for your purpose?

Yes, quite sufficient.

5701. Do you think that that would in any way ameliorate the lot of the workers?

Certainly.

5702. Why?

Because the class of work, instead of coming from Germany and other parts, would be made here.

5703. Will you explain that more fully?

You go to a glover's here, and say, "I require a pair of Dent's gloves;" you buy them, in many cases not that you are a judge of gloves, but because they are Dent's gloves; if they are Dent's gloves they were made here in England; and I maintain that where things are bought in Germany and sold as English goods, that affects the labour here in England in general.

5704. But why should the purchaser care so long as he is satisfied that Messrs. Dent habitually sell a good class of goods, and that they guarantee the goods that they are selling, no matter where they are made?

They do not guarantee at all.

5705. Supposing they do?

You do not deal with Messrs. Dent; you deal with their agents. If you want a bottle of champagne, and ask for Moet's, you do not expect to get anything else, do you?

5706. I do

5706. I do not follow your argument; you say that if the name of the maker were put upon the goods that would improve his position?
I mean the master.

5707. Who would be the maker of an article put out to a house in Bethnal-green; would it not be the person into whose hands it was given to do the work?
No.

5708. Whose name would you have upon it?
The maker, the person who gives out the material to the workpeople who make it.

5709. Is not that what happens now; a man gives out material to a sweater in the East End and marks it with his name?
Yes; that is what I complain of.

5710. And you want the name of what person on it?
The *bonâ fide* maker. You go to Marshall and Snelgrove and say, "Make me a mantle;" they in turn go to Coleman Selincourt, in Cannon-street, and they in turn go to their factory in Pimlico. I want Selincourt and Coleman's name on it.

5711. That is to say, that in your trade there are two middlemen?
And sometimes three.

5712. And you want to do away with the middleman in between such persons as Marshall and Snelgrove and the person who makes it?
Yes, and I want to do away with the City people. A lady will go to her dressmaker and order a dress, and say, "I will have certain trimmings for the dress;" the dressmaker will go to Peter Robinson's, they will say, "We have not got it, but we will get it;" they send to a City house who put up to be manufacturers; they are not manufacturers; and they in their turn send it to Bethnal Green. There are all those intermediate profits.

5713. If these intermediate profits are made, why is it that Marshall and Snelgrove do not themselves have an agent at Bethnal-green, who would put the work out into the shops of the workpeople?
I do not know why they do not do that.

5714. You know no reason for it?
No.

5715. It is obvious that they could themselves take the profit if they were to do that?
If they were to do that.

5716. You can assign no reason why they do not do it?
I can assign no reason.

5717. *Chairman.*] I suppose when you mention, as you have done, one or two particular houses, you merely mention them as examples?
As examples; they are all round alike. Morley's would say that the goods they sell are their manufacture. They manufacture hosiery and put in all the other things with it and lead you to think so.

5718. What class of goods do you manufacture yourself?
Silk trimmings.

5719. And as I understand you, your contention is that those silk trimmings should be marked with your name as the maker?
Yes.

5720. Whereas now, whose name would be on them?
Perhaps the name of the party they would be sold to.

5721. You sell yours to a City house?
Yes, mostly.

5722. Would they put their name on the article?
I do not know about their name; they put their mark on it. In some cases they give me a label to put on the goods. I saw an order that went to Switzerland within this last month. The City house gave their own label to put on them; they came back, and you see them in the West End houses, and by the public they are presumed to be made by these people.

5723. When you put work out, do you send the material?
Yes, I send the material.

5724. You supply the material?
I supply the material.

5725. And you charge the people for it?
We weigh it out, and they return what they have got left.

5726. And you trust them without any security?
They are mostly known.

5727. But no material is supplied to you by the houses that give you the order?
No, the City houses will take 5 per cent. of your goods if they pay you weekly; and yet, even if you were to purchase yourself in their warehouses at the same time as they pay you, they only give you 2½ and sometimes 3¼ per cent.

5728. The City houses charge discount for cash, you mean?
If they pay you weekly, they take 5 per cent. off; and if you purchase any goods of them at the same time, they will only give you 2½, and in some cases 3¼, not more. When they pay you weekly, they take their 5 per cent. off.

5729. And I understand if you buy goods at the City house and pay them cash, they allow you 2½ per cent.?
Yes.

5730. But they charge you 5 per cent. discount for paying weekly?
Yes.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Veneris, 22° *Junii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of CANTERBURY.
Earl of DERBY.
Earl of ONSLOW.
Viscount GORDON (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord CLINTON.
Lord CLIFFORD OF CHUDLEIGH.
Lord FOXFORD (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord ROTHSCHILD.
Lord MONKSWELL.
Lord THRING.

LORD KENRY (EARL OF DUNRAVEN AND MOUNT-EARL), IN THE CHAIR.

THE REVEREND DR. HERMANN ADLER, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

5731. *Chairman.*] You are Delegate Chief Rabbi?
Yes.

5732. You exercise all the duties and functions of the Chief Rabbi?
Yes.

5733. When were you appointed?
I was appointed Delegate Chief Rabbi in the year 1879, owing to my father's advancing years and failing health.

5734. And your duties bring you into close contact with the Jewish population in the East of London?
Into very close contact. The Office of the Chief Rabbi at which I regularly attend is very close to the district where our poor brethren dwell.

5735. I should like to call your attention, first of all, to something attributed to you in Mr. Burnett's Report, in which he says, at page 8, speaking of the influx of female Jews into London: "The overflow has been finding its way into other house industries, and other labour markets are becoming equally crowded. Even these means of refuge to female pauper immigrants have been insufficient. Dr. Hermann Adler sorrowfully admits that the social evil now prevails in the Jewish community which had always been free from it before, until the continued influx of foreign Jewesses unable to find work caused many to be driven on to the streets." Is that a correct statement?
If you will allow me, I would like to read a memorandum on this point and on some few other matters. I will first read the memorandum I have drawn up with regard to your Lordship's question, and, if you will permit me, I would then read to you a very brief statement on some of the subjects connected with with the sweating system with which I am acquainted; and I think it would be a quicker and an easier way of acquainting your Lordships with the various matters of which I am cognisant, of course leaving it to your Lordships to interrupt me and to examine me afterwards on any special points. Have I your permission for that?

5736. I should like to know, first of all, whether Mr. Burnett was correct in attributing that information to you?

 Yes.

Yes. I addressed to the "Pall Mall Gazette" a letter, on the 10th March 1887, of which Mr. Arnold White has taken an unfair and exaggerated advantage——

5737. This has nothing to do with Mr. Arnold White?

A letter on which Mr. Burnett perhaps has put a construction different from that which I intended at the time. The journal in question had brought a grave charge against my community that we are kind and charitable towards those who persevere in the path of virtue, but that when a girl had been guilty of a breach of morality we at once spurn her and cast her out altogether. I replied, indignantly repudiating this charge, and said: "It is an admitted fact that in former years one rarely if ever heard of an unchaste Hebrew maiden in this country. I grieve to be obliged to say that this happy state of things no longer exists. The extension of the social evil to my community may be directly traced to the overstocked labour-market and to the Russian persecutions continuing to this day, which cause thousands of Jewish girls to arrive on these shores without any means of subsistence." I went on to say that, with a view of checking this evil, some of our charitable ladies had formed an association for preventive and rescue work, who anxiously sought out those who had gone astray, and placed them in a home where they were reclaimed and trained to earn an honest livelihood. The experience we have now gained enables me to say that when foreign Jewish girls lead an immoral life here (and their proportion is happily very small) it is not that they are driven to this course by actual want, but because they had already fallen in their own country, or because, on their arrival here, they were inveigled into low coffee-houses connected with houses of ill repute. I am pleased to say that we now succeed in a great measure in checking this evil by sending an officer to await the arrival of every steamer from the northern ports, whose duty it is to take charge of friendless girls, to place them in a respectable lodging-house supervised by our matron, where they have to pay for their own maintenance, and, if possible, to find them situations or work. I may also add that in our rescue home there are at present not more than 11 girls.

5738. When did this appear in the "Pall Mall Gazette"?

On the 10th March 1887.

5739. As I understand you, at that time you were of opinion that the social evil had increased among Jewesses, and at that time you attributed the fact to the large and increased influx of foreign Jewesses into this country, but that afterwards you modified or changed your opinion as to the cause?

I only modified my opinion as to the cause. The fact remains, that whilst formerly, I might say before 1882, one very rarely heard of such cases, they certainly have increased since that date; but the cause is, as I have stated just now, that they either came over, having led immoral lives in all probability in their own country, or were inveigled on their arrival here into low coffee-houses.

5740. You changed your opinion as to the cause?

Quite so. I would now read a very brief memorandum in connection with what you have already questioned me upon, as to the means that I have taken to become acquainted with the condition of my poor. I may add that I am the son of the Reverend Dr. Adler, Chief Rabbi of the United Hebrew Congregations of the British Empire, who was installed in 1845, and thus my acquaintance with the condition of the Jewish poor dates from my earliest years. In 1862 I became a member of the Committee of the Jewish Association for the Diffusion of Religious Knowledge, and in that capacity I visited among our working classes in the East, preached and expounded the Scriptures to them. When elected minister of the Bayswater Synagogue in 1864, I continued my work among the East-end poor. In 1879, owing to my father's advancing years and failing health, I was appointed Delegate Chief Rabbi. Since that date my opportunities for becoming acquainted with the moral and material condition of my poor have greatly increased. The office of the Chief Rabbi is situated close to the districts principally inhabited by our wage-earning classes.

I am

I am Chairman of the Committee of Ministers and Laymen who visit the Jewish poor, and I meet them periodically for the reception of their Reports and for consultation. I preside at the Jewish Ecclesiastical Court, which meets twice a week, and to which our working classes resort in large numbers, to obtain counsel and assistance in their difficulties, and to have their disputes settled. I was a member of the Committee of the Mansion House Fund, established in 1882 for the relief of the victims of Russian persecutions, and I am still one of the trustees of this fund. I have been frequently called upon to arbitrate in disputes arising between employers and their workmen, but, to the best of my recollection, until the present agitation commenced, no complaint has been laid before me as to the lowness of wages paid, or the excessively long hours of work. I have visited many workshops of tailors and boot finishers. The rooms are, in most cases, small and ill ventilated. The sanitary appliances, however, in the workshops I have visited are not deficient, the necessary conveniences being provided with water and kept properly flushed. The improvements in this respect during the last two years are due to the efforts and vigilance of the Sanitary Committee of our Board of Guardians. The hours of work are cruelly long, especially in the boot-finishing trade. I have visited these workshops between ten and eleven at night and found the knifers and finishers hard at work, they having in some instances been engaged in their occupation since five o'clock in the morning, 18 hours being regarded as an ordinary day's work in this trade. And sometimes, when orders are pressing, the workmen commence on Thursday morning, and toil on right through the night until late on Friday evening. A well-authenticated case came under my notice some time ago, of a poor fellow who fell down dead in the middle of his work from the effects of over-fatigue and under-feeding. Sometimes they do not give themselves the requisite leisure to eat a proper meal, but snatch up a piece of bread with either a bit of meat or a morsel of herring during their work. It must, at the same time, be borne in mind that, having regard to the two days per week which are lost and the period of slack trade, the time worked by the hardest toiler probably never exceeds 10 hours per day, averaged all the year round. It has been alleged that the existence of the sweating system is entirely due to the immigration of pauper foreigners. This may be the case in respect to certain trades, but in a considerable number it is well known that foreigners are not employed. And even in respect to tailoring, it should be remembered that certain evils of the system prevailed more than 40 years ago, which were vehemently denounced by Canon Kingsley. As to the causes of the sweating system, I speak with considerable hesitancy as economics are hardly within my province. I would only say that, as far as my observations allow me to judge, this system is due to fierce commercial competition consequent on merchants and shippers ceasing to deal with large warehouses where fair living prices were paid, and going direct to small manufacturers who employ sweaters, and whose prices are governed rather by the desire to get orders than by the desire to do a business that would give everyone a fair and legitimate profit. I admit that the influx of Russian and Polish Jews has increased since the year 1882, when active persecutions commenced; but may not this inflow be likened to a drop in the London ocean? That the increase is not so large as is generally supposed is proved by the mortality statistics furnished by the United Synagogue, a religious organisation which, among many other important functions, undertakes the free burial of our poor, and, therefore, practically of our working classes. I can only give the figures for the last two years. Whilst in 1886 the total number of free burials was 670, it fell to 642 in 1887. Dr. Asher, the Secretary of the United Synagogue, is able to furnish full statistics. I may confidently assert that the immigration is not owing to any agency or organisation that invites the poor Jew to this country, as seems to have been suggested in Nos. 5077 and 5150. They come here, having been expelled from the towns which they have inhabited all their lives, and to escape oppression in the form of restrictive laws and enactments that prevent them from earning a subsistence. I may cite in illustration two cases which have come under my notice this week. A native of Russia, a man of high intelligence but completely impoverished, has come here, being one of the 400 families that have been expelled from Moscow, having been forced to leave the city within

within three days. Another refugee had been deprived of the right he had long enjoyed, of keeping a restaurant at a railway station. It will also be remembered that in 1885 a large number of Russians who had been settled in Germany for many years were ordered to leave that country, and many of them came to England. In concert with our Board of Guardians, I use my best efforts to prevent my poor foreign co-religionists from coming here. I am in continual correspondence with the leading rabbis of Russia, and I do not fail to point out to them that the streets of London are not paved with gold, but are watered with the tears of those that seek bread and find it not. I was deeply pained to learn from the evidence given by the Rev. Dr. Billing, Bishop Designate of Bedford, on Friday last, that he entertains so unfavourable a view of the general moral condition of the bulk of our working classes. He says, in answer to Question 5040, "No one who has not lived amongst these people can have any idea of the awful results of the way in which they are thus herded together for the purpose of just making a livelihood and living at as cheap a rate as possible." Again he says, in answer to Question 5077 "These poor creatures who are brought over here have no knowledge of the common decencies of life." Your Lordships will permit me to say that I entertain the deepest regard for the rector of Spitalfields, and I gladly testify to the kindness and consideration he has on many occasions shown to my poor brethren. I am sure he would not willingly malign them; but I must state that my experience, and the experience of those who are intimately acquainted with the condition of our poor, do not bear out the grave imputations of Dr. Billing. I admit that the Russian and Polish Jew is, on arrival here, not sufficiently cleanly in his habits and his person. This is due to his coming from countries in which the standard of cleanliness is unhappily very low, where sanitary appliances, familar to us, are unknown, and vital laws of health systematically ignored. Some time ago a young Russia nobleman accompanied me on my visits to some of the worst tenements inhabited by our poor. He assured me that they were vastly superior to the hovels tenanted by the Moujik in his own country. This will answer Lord Monkswell's question (No. 5180), "Do greeners live in London under different conditions from the poor Christian residents in Russia and Poland?" I am aware that in Booth-street Buildings and some other localities, there is a great lack of cleanliness, and practices occur repugnant to our civilised ideas. This is due to the inadequate number and bad construction of the sanitary conveniences, evils for which surveyors and sanitary inspectors should be made responsible rather than the poor inmates. I have no hesitation in asserting that within a comparatively short period these foreigners become civilised, mainly through their children who are carefully trained in our great free school, and in the board schools, and who thus soon become Anglicised in both speech and habits. It is of great interest to note how Polish children who have arrived here, quite uncouth, ignorant of a word of English, become civilised and clean in their habits within a few months, and long before they leave school they are able to speak our language as though they had been born here. And I must entirely dissent from Dr. Billing's contention, in answer to Question 5198, that the Jews do not conform to the Gentile living even to the second and third generation. I likewise join issue with him in his denunciation of the moral condition of this section of my community. I have walked through the districts inhabited by them, I have entered their homes at all hours of the day and night, and I have never heard any objectionable language or seen aught repugnant to morality. As a rule, perfect quiet and order prevail both in the street and the homes. Cases of drunkenness, and of brutal treatment of women and children, are never to be witnessed. I do not wish to make out that this class is better than others; all that I contend is that the lowest class of these Poles is certainly not worse than a similar class belonging to other nationalities and denominations.

5741. I beg your pardon for interrupting you for one moment; will you tell me to what part of Mr. Billing's evidence you refer?

I refer to the passages occurring in answer to Questions 5047 and 5077. I may mention that I, of course, do not go by the reports in the newspapers, but that I referred to the printed minutes of evidence taken before your Lordships, and that it is distinctly stated by him that he refers both to the moral and physical condition of this section of the community. Then, further, Dr. Billing reproaches them for neither

neither keeping the Jewish Sabbath nor the Christian Lord's Day. I admit that there may be a very small minority who are compelled to work on Saturdays to keep themselves from starvation. The practice also obtains among many tailoring operatives of taking back their work to the warehouses on Saturdays; a practice for which these poor people should hardly be held responsible. But I maintain unhesitatingly that the scrupulousness and readiness to make sacrifices with which this people keep their Sabbaths and festivals are beyond all praise. The Bishop Designate speaks of the prejudices existing between Jews and Gentiles and their unwillingness to live and work with each other, (in answer to Questions 5077 and 5106). This is not borne out by my experience. I find that Jews and Christians dwell peacefully together in many streets and blocks; for example, in the Brunswick Buildings and the dwellings erected by the City Corporation. Mr. Baker, the superintendent of the former, the Brunswick Buildings, writes to me with reference to the inhabitants of the Buildings: "I find there is about an equal number of Jews and of Christians, say about 130 of each; and I should think, so far as I can judge, that, in point of cleanliness and paying their rent, there is not much difference, and which is fairly satisfactory." The Charlotte de Rothschild Buildings are occupied by 158 Jewish and 42 Christian families. I have seen Christians labouring with perfect contentment in Jewish workshops, and I have ascertained that 90 per cent. of the masters to whom our lads are apprenticed by our Board of Guardians are Christians. I may add that strenuous efforts are being made for the moral and religious welfare of our poor. The principal agencies are, the Jews' Free School in Bell-lane, the Infant Schools in Commercial-street and Tenter-street, the Jewish schools in Stepney Green, and the religious classes established by the Association for the Diffusion of Religious Knowledge in connection with six East End Board Schools. Would your Lordship wish me, in conclusion, to say a few words on the remedies of the evils caused by the sweating system, partially my own, and partially those furnished to me by those who have a very accurate knowledge, Messrs. Newman, who were formerly themselves employed in sweating workshops and are now boot manufacturers, and have obtained considerable experience?

5742. I think we should be glad to have your own suggestions with regard to remedies?

With respect to the remedies of the sweating system, I fully endorse the recommendations that the provisions of the Factory and Public Health Acts be strictly enforced. There should be compulsory registration, due and effectual supervision of every place used as a workshop, including domestic workshops. Additional inspectors should be appointed, the present number being wholly inadequate. I would suggest that in every workshop where more than six workpeople are employed there should be separate sanitary conveniences for males and females. The conclusion of this statement I will not read to your Lordships, as it does not contain exclusively my own suggestions, although some of them I would adopt and endorse.

5743. I think that you have rather, perhaps, misunderstood the evidence of Mr. Billing on some points, and perhaps that, to some extent, is my fault. I find that Mr. Billing said, for instance, at No. 5048: "No one who has not lived amongst these people can have any idea of the awful results of the way in which they are thus herded together for the purpose of just making a livelihood and living at as cheap a rate as possible." I then asked Mr. Billing: "Do you mean the moral results"? and he answered, "Yes, the moral and physical results." I think the sense in which you use the word "moral" is different from the sense in which I used it in that question. The meaning of my question was whether the condition in which these people lived was not, to use an ordinary word, demoralising to them, mentally as well as physically; it did not allude to the morals of the people in the sense in which you use the term?

It is important that such correction should go forth, lest perhaps the Russian Government might turn round and say, You see that in England it is considered that the moral condition of these people is so very bad, and hence we are justified in the harsh treatment to which we subject them.

5744. You also commented upon the fact of Mr. Billing alleging that Jews worked on their Sabbath. You observe that Mr. Billing says: "For the most part they are very particular about the observance of their own Sabbath, but many of that community have told me how a great deal of Sabbath work is done." I understand you to say that, to your knowledge, you admit that Sabbath work is occasionally done?

A little, by a very small minority.

5745. I should like to ask you one question on another point. I think you said that a case had come before you of a man who had been expelled from Moscow within three days?

That he was ordered to leave Moscow within three days. I believe I have the letter with me.

5746. Have you seen the order on which he was expelled?

I have not seen the order; but he seems to be a man of respectability, and his words deserving of credence.

5747. You do not know why he was expelled?

An order was made: it was in all the papers; that all merchants below the degree of the first guild were to be ordered out of the city on a certain day.

5748. That you do not know of your own personal knowledge?

I do not know it of my own personal knowledge; I only know what has been written by my correspondent and in the newspapers.

5749. Have you ever seen any order under which any Jews have been expelled from Russia?

I have seen orders under which they have been expelled from Prussia; but, as regards Russia, I hesitate about saying that I have absolutely seen the orders. I think there are no written orders, or if there be any, they are taken from them at the frontier; but I have had numerous letters sent to me, letters of recommendation, with which these people have been furnished by their rabbis, stating that they have been thus expelled; and I have heard it from the lips of those people, and have not the slightest reason to question the truth of their statements.

5750. What is the reason that they give for being expelled; what reason did this man whom you alluded to, who was ordered out of Moscow, give?

He was expelled in common with 400 families who were ordered to leave at the same time, merely because they were Israelites.

5751. But for what reason?

I believe he gives no reason in that letter. I have the letter here, if I may read from it what relates to this question: "I am a native of Russia. I lived about 16 years in St. Petersburg and Moscow"; and then, after speaking about his own private affairs, he goes on: "You read in the newspapers of the expulsion from Moscow of 400 families, among whom my family suffered, as there was no mercy; so that even the son of the Rabbi, Meyer Levin, was expelled. All the protection of our influential co-religious brethren being absolutely in vain, the Attorney General Turkovsky declining all petitions, and in the course of three days we had to leave the city."

5752. Does he give the reason?

He gives no further reason. The bare fact of his being a Jew, and not being a member of the first guild of merchants, is, according to Russian law, sufficient ground for expulsion from any town, except certain particular districts where Jews have always been permitted to reside.

5753. What I wanted to get at is the cause. You said (I forget your exact words) that you were certain that there was no kind of organisation on the continent for sending Jews over to this country?

On that point I think I can speak with well nigh absolute certainty. We question the people who come over here why they have left, and not the remotest hint has ever been given to us that such an organisation exists; nor is there any reason why the people who come here should deny the existence of any agency.

5754. You think that, if such an agency did exist, it would have come under your notice?

Beyond doubt.

5755. Do

5755. Do these Jews come under your notice on their arrival here?
Not all of them by any means, as we have the Jewish Board of Guardians where they would apply in case of absolute need, but a considerable proportion of them, who have letters of recommendation from the places whence they have come, or whence they have been expelled, come to me with their credentials.

5756. Do you know the parish of Spitalfields very well?
I know it extremely well. I have resided close to it for 22 years.

5757. Have you visited many of the houses there?
I have visited a good many of the houses and workshops at all times, and so have the members of the Jewish ministry who visit in the district, and who have reported to me and do report to me regularly.

5758. You have never lived there yourself?
I have never lived in the parish of Spitalfields, but within a few minutes' walk of it.

5759. You do not know whether it is correct that large numbers of Jews who can speak no English are living there?
On all those points I can speak with absolute certainty, because I move continually among them.

5760. Is that the case or not, that there are a large number of Jews living there who can speak no English?
It is the case certainly that the new arrivals do not speak English, and there are considerable numbers of those who are still there, meaning the adults, who speak very little English.

5761. Has the number of those who cannot speak English been increasing for the last two or three, or four or five years?
Certainly, in consequence of an influx which is going on, though not to so large an extent as is generally believed and alleged.

5762. Earl of *Onslow.*] You recommended, I think, the registration of the workshops; do you mean that the inmates, the occupants of the workshops should register?
The owners of the workshops.

5763. Do you mean the landlords?
The owners, those that keep the so-called sweating workshops; they should be called upon to register.

5764. Then I think you must mean the occupiers?
Yes, the occupiers.

5765. Would the same result be attained if those who give out work to the sweating shops were compelled to keep a register of the places to which they gave work?
I have not studied this branch of the subject sufficiently, and would hardly like to give an answer on this important question.

5766. Lord *Clinton.*] Would you charge a fee for registration?
Not a high fee by any means, but a small and nominal fee, principally in order to secure that the inspectors should go into these workshops and should know of their existence.

5767. And you would inflict a fine, I suppose, for non-registration?
Certainly.

5768. Lord *Monkswell.*] You said that there was a slight falling off of the burials between the years 1886 and 1887, and that that tended to show that there was a diminution in the number of the Jewish population; it seems to me that the number of burials is not altogether a reliable test, because the Jews might be more numerous, but their average age might be younger owing to the immigration of young Jews?
I do not say that those figures absolutely prove that there has been diminution, but that they show that there has not been so great an increase as is generally supposed.

5769. *Chairman.*] I think you said that the Jews do amalgamate tolerably readily with the Gentile population?

After they have resided here for some little time, undoubtedly.

5770. Is it not impossible for them to fully do so on account of their religious observances?

There is, of course, the law which prevents intermarriages.

5771. I mean, rather, is it not difficult for them to work together?

On account of the Sabbath, certainly; but, for example, in the case that I have before mentioned, the instance of the apprentices, every facility is given by the Christian masters to enable their Jewish apprentices to keep their Sabbath and festivals.

5772. The Sabbath is the only thing that stands in the way of their working together?

The Sabbath and the festivals.

5773. Can you give the Committee any information as to the number of Jews of foreign birth at present in London?

It is utterly impossible to do so. There are no means at all of getting at trustworthy information on this subject.

5774. You have spoken of the Jewish Board of Guardians; are there any other societies that assist Jews in distress in London?

There are some other societies; principally there are the Ladies' Benevolent and Visiting Society, and the Ladies' Lying-in Charity; and there is the Jews' Hospital and Orphan Asylum, which has at present something like 250 inmates, where they are trained especially also in technical work, the Jews' Emigration Society, the Jewish Home for the Aged; and several other institutions. During the winter there is a soup kitchen, and a bread and meat and coal charity.

5775. But do you think that, as a rule, you may safely say that the Jewish Board of Guardians become acquainted with the amount of Jewish distress; that the Jews in distress become known to the Jewish Board of Guardians?

Yes, decidedly; everything on that subject would be known to them, and on that point they are able to give full and entire information about almost every poor Jew in London.

5776. They never give relief until the applicant has resided for six months in the country; you are aware of that?

As a rule. But the rule is relaxed in exceptional cases of distress.

5777. What do you suppose becomes of the immigrants who have been mentioned before the Committee as arriving in a destitute condition?

The fellow countrymen of these people residing here are very kind, and sympathetic, and charitable, and they would provide for them when they arrive absolutely destitute; but I think, as a rule, it may be mentioned that the cases in which they arrive quite penniless are rare.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. JOHN BLUNDELL MAPLE (a Member of the House of Commons), having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

5778. *Chairman.*] You are a partner in the firm of Maple and Company?

I am.

5779. You are Member of Parliament for the Dulwich Division of Camberwell?

I am.

5780. How long have you been a partner in the firm?

I have been actively engaged in the business for 27 years, and a partner for the last 21 years.

5781. In

5781. In what capacity were you in the firm prior to your becoming a partner?

I was engaged in the business as the son of my father, working naturally in all the different departments, so that I have a thorough knowledge of the trade; and my father has been in business for nearly 50 years; and I may say that during the 50 years not one single word has been breathed against the honesty of our dealings, or our treatment of our *employés*.

5782. Could you tell the Committee the other partners of the firm?

My father and myself are the partners; we have seven junior partners.

5783. What is the difference in the position of the junior partners?

That we have the option of determining their partnership when we like.

5784. Can you tell us who are the seven junior partners?

There is Mr. Henry Adams, Mr. Horace Regnart, Mr. Henry Regnart, Mr. Frederick Lunnis, Mr. Edward Rayner, Mr. Robert Tubby, and Mr. Robert Blundell.

5785. I think perhaps it would be convenient if you could explain to the Committee how the business of your firm is generally conducted, as to the various departments it is divided into?

I have prepared here a statement which I thought I would read, and then afterwards deal with the evidence which has been given?

5786. Do you explain it in your statement?

I do explain certain things in my statement which I think will assist the Committee in arriving at the conclusion that they want.

5787. Do you answer the question I have just asked you in your statement?

I think I do. At the present time our premises in Tottenham Court-road and the adjacent streets cover an area of about four acres, and when it is considered that some of the buildings are seven storeys high, some idea may be gained as to the extent of the firm. We employ over 2,000 hands directly, paying them weekly or monthly wages. I have prepared for this Committee a complete list of the weekly earnings, ending the 12th of May last, of those engaged by my firm. I was immensely surprised and astonished to see the slanderous statements made by Mr. Arnold White against my firm, which statements I am prepared to prove he has not substantiated.

5788. Is the statement that you propose to read prepared by yourself?

It is.

5789. And its accuracy you can attest on your own knowledge?

Entirely so; I dictated every word of it myself, and it is taken from a shorthand note.

5790. From your own dictation?

Yes.

5791. All that I want to ascertain is, whether you yourself are personally responsible for everything you say, or whether you give information to the best of your belief, and on which you can suggest witnesses to substantiate it, whom the Committee could call?

Everything that I state here is of my own personal knowledge. I am intimately connected with my business, and I fully take the whole responsibility of the firm. I am engaged there continually; I have been there this morning. I was immensely surprised and astonished to see the slanderous statements made by Mr. Arnold White against my firm, which statements I am prepared to prove he has not substantiated by the evidence adduced, although he has brought men forward, some of whom have perjured themselves, whilst others have slandered my firm on what may be called only hearsay evidence. All this would not have been allowed had your Lordships permitted me the opportunity which I asked, of cross-examining the witnesses, as was granted by another Select Committee, and these slanderous and damaging statements which have been

been made would not have been circulated as they have been through the Press, broadcast, creating a damage that no money can ever repay. It is not the pecuniary loss to which I refer, but to that which is caused by slanderous and perjured statements to the honoured name of a man like my father, who, throughout the whole of his career, both commercial and private, has done much to maintain the honour and straightforward dealing which an Englishman should ever try to emulate, and by which he has always borne an unsullied name.

5792. Lord *Thring.*] You are prepared to prove that the witnesses have perjured themselves?

I am, thoroughly.

5793. *Chairman.*] You are aware that the privileges of the Committee would not protect the witnesses, if that were the case?

Not the perjury; but when I have adduced the whole of this evidence before your Lordships, and before the country at large through the Press, I think you will see how maligned has been our firm, how perjured are these statements given by some of the witnesses, and I believe that you will see that there has been also conspiracy, and a vile and foul conspiracy.

5794. But are you prepared to bring actions against these men who you say have perjured themselves?

If your Lordships are convinced that there is perjury, I am prepared to bring actions against these people.

5795. It will not be for this Committee, but for a court of law, to decide that?

When you have heard what I state, and what we shall have stated on oath, by the different witnesses who shall be called, I think that will be the time, and not till then.

5796 You have stated that certain witnesses before the Committee have perjured themselves; I asked you whether you proposed to bring actions for perjury against them?

I could not think of doing so until you have finished your inquiry; I have no wish or intention to interfere with the deliberations of this Committee. Any man who goes in for political life, and for trying to do the best for his fellow-creatures, would wish well of any inquiry like yours, which should bring forward some remedy for the great distress which exists among our working classes.

5797. I mean that, if you bring accusations of that nature, of course you will understand that a court of law would be the proper place to substantiate them, and not this Committee?

That would be a question for me to deal with hereafter. I am glad at last that your Lordships have given me an opportunity of appearing before you, and I trust that you will allow me, as I am prepared to do, to bring forward witnesses to prove that the witnesses who have given evidence before you, and who have been paid, for Mr. Arnold White himself says that he has spent hundreds of pounds in getting up this case, have stated that which is altogether untrue, and which I characterise, in many instances, as perjury, and bears to my mind a strong suspicion of conspiracy. I say conspiracy, for I am able to prove and adduce letters written by Mr. Arnold White's solicitors and Mr. Parnell to different tradespeople, asking them to give evidence against my firm, and waiting upon different tradespeople, and trying to get them to state things which they were unable to do. I can also prove that important evidence has been withheld, which, considering the public utility that this inquiry is intended to serve, and considering the claims that Mr. Arnold White makes upon the credulity of the public as to being a philanthropist, as having no personal spite, and only wanting to elicit the truth, shows most distinctly the conspiracy which exists. As an instance, Henry Miller, whose real name is Theodore Müller, has said nothing as to a man of the name of Wicks being a partner with him from his commencement in business for three or four years, and Mr. Arnold White has never mentioned the existence of such a man, but I shall ask for him to be examined before your Lordships' Committee. Thomas Fisher also, who was managing

managing clerk to this firm of Miller and Wicks, was likewise not called, because both Wicks and Fisher were able to prove the falsity of the perjured statements made by Miller, as to our ever charging for cashing our cheques; as also that his other evidence was mostly untrue. In point of fact, I make bold to say that your Lordships' Committee has been made the means of slanderously attacking my firm and myself, partly for trade jealousies (as I shall be able to show), and partly from political animosity (which also I think I shall be able to show). It is my intention, with your Lordships' permission, to call my counting-house junior partner and my cash clerk, who will prove that, during the many years that they have had charge of the cash, and they only have had charge of the cash, never has my firm, nor have they personally, charged one farthing for cashing any cheques. Our cheques are crossed in the printing; but we are always willing, and never refuse on being asked, to make our cheques payable at counter, and although we bank at the Union Bank, in Argyle-place, and have done so for the last 20 years, the Union Bank have a branch now opposite us in Tottenham Court-road, and they at all times cash our cheques, when payable at counter, at this branch, and the stamp we use to open the cheque is as follows: "Please pay at counter. Payable at counter, Tottenham Court-road branch." They can be cross-examined upon these points, and I hope your Lordships will cross-examine myself upon any subject that you may desire to be informed upon affecting our business. I also desire that your Lordships shall have my junior partner, Mr. Horace Regnart, against whom, personally, some of the witnesses have spoken, before you; also the foreman of the upholsterers, Mr. Imlay; the foreman of the joiners and of the cabinet-makers; and a great many outside manufacturers who have done business for us for some years. Directly I saw that this Committee was sitting, and that the slanderous statements and assertions appeared in the press, I at once communicated with Mr. Arnold White, who gave that evidence, and through my solicitors offered him every facility to make inquiries as to the truth of the statements that had been made to him, explaining at the same time the inadvisibility of such slanderous statements being made before your Lordships. I much regret to say that, notwithstanding such invitation, Mr. Arnold White refused to satisfy himself, or to even hear our side of the question previous to bringing further witnesses before your Lordships. If he had done so, no doubt the object of himself, and those with whom he is working, would not have been attainable; their object, without doubt, being that he should cause as much injury commercially, socially, and politically, as he possibly could to myself and the firm with which I am connected. Who is this Mr. Arnold White, that he should be allowed to traduce, without cross-examination, my firm, whose reputation for straightforward and honest dealing is respected and honoured throughout the length and breadth of the land? As far as I have been able to gather, he is publicly known as having been defeated, in the Radical interest, at Mile End, at the last Election, and his public record, apparently, is limited to this. Besides our firm in Tottenham Court-road, we are represented by an establishment in Paris, and another in Smyrna, and our business relations are throughout all parts of the world; in fact, we attract and search for business everywhere; in India, and also in Buenos Ayres, only just lately, we have had representatives searching for and obtaining work for our working classes here. The evidence as adduced I have read most carefully, and I propose going through it, witness by witness, and showing how untruthful they all have been who have mentioned my firm in connection with your inquiry, while generally withholding the names of other firms, who conduct business on the same lines as we do. I trust that your Lordships, acting as you are on behalf of the House of Lords, an assembly which has ever been considered one that an honest tradesman might appeal to for justice; after I have convinced you as to the slanderous insinuations which have been made, and after you have heard, as you will do, from many witnesses that I am prepared to adduce, a total refutation of the charges made, will not only come to the conclusion, but will give us a public declaration to the effect, that the charges made against us of being sweaters are uncalled for and most unjust. How can we be sweaters?

According to Mr. Burnett, we are no sweaters. We do not sweat ourselves, nor do we employ any firms who can be considered sweaters; all the firms we employ have either factories or workshops of their own. It is true that we do not produce on our premises everything that we sell. We do not manufacture carpets, nor curtains, nor bedsteads, nor linens, blankets, ironmongery, china and glass, nor do we manufacture all the furniture which we sell, although we are daily increasing our cabinet factories in Tottenham Court-road, and we have also factories working exclusively for us at Islington, where 144 cabinet-makers, painters, and polishers are employed. We import and season enormous quantities of timber, and at our timber yards, at the different docks and sawmills, we have one of the largest stocks of seasoned wood ever brought together. I adduce the stock lists for your Lordships, which we held, of timber, in England alone, on the 12th May this year. You will see by this list that we hold, of hard woods, 4,476 logs and 3,507 planks; of deals, 132,553; and of various veneers in hard wood, thousands of leaves, staves, and various squares for legs of tables, &c.; in fact, we hold 37,076 pieces ready cut for legs, in ash, mahogany, and walnut, &c. This enormous stock of timber we hold, so that the furniture we manufacture, or which is manufactured under our directions, should be of well-seasoned materials. We should not have become timber merchants, and excited the trade jealousies by so doing, but we found it impossible to rely upon getting seasoned woods from the timber yards of other persons; and being responsible for all furniture sold in our establishment, your Lordships will see the importance of this branch of our business. We manufacture all bedding on the premises, although but few other firms that I am aware of in the whole of London besides ourselves do the same. Messrs. Gillow——

5798. Earl of *Limerick.*] Where it is not necessary for your argument to give the names, perhaps you will not mention any names?

This is rather pertinent to the question.

5799. *Chairman.*] I understood you to say that in some cases the names of other firms have been suppressed or not mentioned, with the object of showing that your firm carried on a business in a way not customary in the trade, and it is that charge which you are now meeting?

Yes. We manufacture all bedding on the premises, although but few other firms, that I am aware of, in the whole of London beside ourselves do the same. Messrs. Gillow, Collinson & Lock, and most of the old West-end houses (who are so jealous of the business we do) buy, if not all their bedding, some of it, and are possibly unaware as to the condition of the shops and the workpeople who manufacture the bedding they sell, whereas my firm has made on our premises every single piece of bedding sold by us for the last 15 years. Last year we manufactured 24,298 different mattresses and palliasses; we also sold and delivered 15,208 bedsteads and 4,067 wire-woven mattresses. Besides other descriptions of furniture, we manufactured, or caused to be manfactured for us, 2,823 bedroom suites. We have, as your Lordships will presently see, a large quantity of upholsterers, cabinet-makers, carpet-planners, painters, decorators, joiners, polishers, packers, carmen, and other descriptions of workpeople, besides hundreds of salesmen and clerks, in constant employ; and I would call your Lordship's attention to a meeting, held on the 18th of May last at Tolmer's-square Institute, when the representative foreman and a large body of some thousand workpeople attended and unanimously passed a resolution to the following effect: "In consequence of the unfounded and erroneous statements made before the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the Sweating System, and accusing Messrs. Maple & Co. of paying their workpeople at a sweating rate of wages, we feel it our duty to hold a mass meeting to protest against such statements going forth to the public uncontradicted, and to vindicate our characters before the working classes." This meeting was held without our cognisance, and was addressed by different foremen from among the working men. You will see, as I stated, that these scurrilous and cowardly attacks upon the firm and men and women employed were considered by this meeting to be partly political and partly due to trade jealousies. That meeting speaks for itself, but I think that your Lordships' Committee will see much

much better tell-tale in our pay-sheets, whereon you will find the number of years that each of the employés has been engaged in the firm. I contend, and if your Lordships will give me the opportunity I think I can prove, that no firm throughout the world can boast of giving greater contentment to their workpeople, and of getting longer service from their workpeople, in proportion to the number employed, than my firm. It is erroneously thought and asserted by some of our enemies that my father and myself do not interest ourselves in the business and in the welfare of our employés, but such is altogether false; either myself or my father is always to be found on the firm, and my father, although 73 years of age, may, as a rule, be found there from half past ten in the morning until half past six at night. I also, until just lately, have been most assiduous in my attention, being in business from early until late; and when your Lordships consider that we have seven junior partners interested in the firm, you will understand that the business has still our most careful attention and consideration. As regards sweating, if by that is meant long hours and bad pay, our factories and our show rooms do not open until eight o'clock in the morning, and are closed at seven every evening, and on Saturdays at two. The wages sheet will show that we pay per hour as much as any of the best firms; in fact, since I commenced business I have endeavoured, on one notable occasion, and on others, to get for the workpeople of London higher pay. On examining the workpeople your Lordships will find that in no firm is there such constant employment found, and that results from the fact that year by year we are increasing by thousands of pounds our turnover, so much so that at the present time our returns are considerably over a million sterling, and we are necessarily always taking on fresh hands. As regards being sweaters, again I would say that it has always been our endeavour to remove hard work from our employés, and the machinery which we have in Tottenham-court-road, and which we have assisted others who manufacture for us to erect, by lending them money, has removed all the hard planing, sawing, and turning work that used to attach to cabinet-making. Even our sewing machines, used by our workwomen in the upholstery department, are driven by gas-engine power, so that they have not to tread the machines in the same way that they did. The witnesses that Mr. Arnold White called before you state that sweating does not exist in the cabinet and the upholstery trades; but for the sake of introducing the name of my firm in the damaging way that they have they have pretended to see the germs, as they call it, of the sweating system coming into the trade, and they lay to our charge the introduction of these germs.

5800. Do you mean to say that no evidence has been given before this Committee that sweating exists in the cabinet-making trade?

I am hardly prepared to say that I have examined carefully the evidence of the other witnesses that have been called that have not touched upon my particular line, but I say that as regards the firm with which I am connected, and I may say other large firms of London, like my neighbour, Messrs. Shoolbred, who conduct their business on the same lines, neither there, nor on our own premises, do any of us, that I am aware of, deal with any one that encourages sweating, any more than Her Majesty's Government do at the present time. I can bring forward hundreds of manufacturers who have done business with us for 20, 30, or 40 years, who never had a commercial dispute with our firm. I can bring Messrs. Crossley, the great carpet house of Halifax, with whom we have done, during the last 10 years, some 220,000 *l.* worth of business; and Messrs. Brinton, of Kidderminster, with whom we have done even more; and other manufacturers from all parts of the world; and as to the reputation that we hold amongst our own customers, including all the Courts of Europe, being upholsterers, as we are, to the Queen, serving, I may say, nearly all the members of the Royal Family, all the principal railway companies and hotels, and last year having done business with over 25,000 families, all these by their continued patronage are a proof of our honourable dealing, the usefulness that we are in supplying the wants of customers and in dispersing the goods for the producers (Mr. White says that such establishments are not required), as also in employing so many of the working classes. Now as to this

evidence which has been brought against us, although your Lordships have given weeks to Mr. Arnold White, and those working with him, to collect, by fair means or foul, evidence against my firm, what is the sum total of the evidence that they have brought against this firm during the 50 years' trading that we have carried on? The analysis of the evidence is simply this: Mr. Arnold White's slanderous statements, which I shall prove were unfounded and unjustifiable, and those of Henry Miller, George Elcock, William Franklin Dickson, Peter Van Damme, and John Boswell Richards, who are mostly persons who have been unsuccessful in business, and have had some trade disputes (and generally from 10 to 15or 16 years since, and, as I shall be able to prove, whose evidence is unreliable; in fact, some of them, I think, your Lordships will find have committed perjury. Then you have the evidence of Mr. William Parnell, of Mr. Henry Waltham, of Frederick Charles Baum, and of Harry Hamm. They are secretaries of old trade societies, who gave nearly all hearsay evidence, still most slanderous, F. C. Baum being the only man of those four ever employed on the firm. Then we have the evidence of Thomas Brown, Thomas Shaughnessy, and William Adams, whose evidence, especially that of the last named, will be found equally misleading and untruthful. Some of your witnesses would insinuate that we mislead the public by false statements to our customers. We do fix our name to bedding manufactured by ourselves, and say that it is manufactured by ourselves. We affix our names to bedsteads, using the words "Manufactured for Maple & Co." We have woven into yards of carpets the name of our firm (*producing a piece of carpet, and some labels and stamps*), guaranteeing thereby the quality of that special make of carpet; and we do stamp our name upon certain articles of furniture; but your Lordships must be aware that this is done by other tradespeople; by gunmakers, by china dealers, by cutlers, and by no end of other tradesmen. But inasmuch as we make ourselves responsible for every article of furniture that we sell in Tottenham Court road, and are prepared at all times, and at all costs, to put anything right that has not turned out satisfactorily, we think that we cannot be blamed for so doing. The fact of our name being thereon must be considered not in any way as representing that each identical piece of furniture was made by us, but as a guarantee to the public of the durability of the article. What more harm is there in our examining, and giving our certificate, and affixing our mark of certificate on an article manufactured by workpeople in other shops than on one manufactured by workpeople working in our own shops? I am convinced that, by concentrating large businesses we are able to get produced for the public, while paying the workpeople equally good wages per week as the old-fashioned houses, articles much cheaper than heretofore. We are also, by having a large business, able to manage the expenses of our firm at a much lower rate than a small firm possibly could. In fact, we are in the cabinet and furnishing trades, but a similar establishment to the large co-operative stores in the other trades, and it is strange to me that the witnesses who have been brought before your Lordships should have singled out my firm, and not have attacked these co-operative stores. Your Lordships must know that, beyond the statement I now make that all descriptions of workmen employed on our firm are getting (this is an important statement that I make here) as high, if not higher, wages per week as they ever got, the purchasing coin of the realm has increased enormously in value, and, therefore, I state that the working classes in the cabinet trades are far better off than they ever were before in the large employs. I should be delighted, if your Lordships so decide, to allow a Sub-Committee of yourselves to visit our establishment in Tottenham Court-road, and to let you personally examine any employé therein found; and I am convinced that you will see how unjustifiable, how slanderous, how vindictive, and how un-English has been this scurrilous attack, made, as I said before, for political and trade purposes, against the honoured name of my father, and, I hope I may say, the honoured name of myself. A complaint has been made by the secretaries to the trades union societies, before your Lordships, that my firm employs boys, and apprentices them without a premium, giving them thereby a technical education; yet I believe that this system is a cause of the long employment and many years' service

service which the majority of our *employés* give. They come to us from school, and are promoted by gradations, so that all classes, having an education such as is given by the School Boards, are able, through connecting themselves with a large firm like ourselves, or Messrs. Shoolbred, to rise, through their own exertions, to any position in the commercial world. It is this employment, which we are able to give through sub-division of labour, that appears to be so irritating to these old-fashioned trade societies, who apparently would like to monopolise the labour market, doing the work, which is easily and as effectively done, by their juniors. I will now proceed to deal with the evidence of each of the witnesses you have had before you. I will, however, first, with your Lordships' permission, put in a list of workpeople in the employ of Messrs. Maple and Co., and the salaries paid during the week ending the 12th of May 1888, with the period of service entered against the names of all the *employés*. You will see that we had 1,295 men and boys employed on the premises in the different manufacturing departments, workpeople, you may say; 391 women and girls, and 365 salesmen, and clerks and managers; making a total of 2,051. These pay-sheets will show the payments that they each received for the week ending the 12th of May, and also you will see how long they have been in the employment of the firm. They vary; but you will find that the workpeople (I take the first sheet as it comes), they vary, have been with us for 17½ years, 16 years, 10 years, 23 years, 20 years, and so on; you will hardly see any question of months, excepting as the business increases and new labour is required. It is quite an extraordinary thing for even any *employé* to leave the firm whence once seated there. The first sheet are upholsterers; on the next sheet come upholsteresses; women have been working on the firm 23 years, 22 years, 12 years, 9 years, 19 years, 24 years, 23 years, and so on; running here all in the tens for a good many pages.

5801. Earl of *Limerick*.] Would it be possible to distinguish between the number of men and the number of boys?

No, not by these sheets.

5802. *Chairman*.] Those are not the actual pay sheets?

This is a copy from the actual pay sheets of 2,000 people.

5803. That is compiled from the pay sheets?

This is compiled from the pay sheets. You will see "upholsteresses"; you will see also as regards our blind makers, 15 years, 11 years, 4¾ years. As regards the women in this department, 16 years; and even where the girls and young people are learning you will also notice their length of service. Then as regards mattress makers, 22 years, 11 years, 16 years; these figures are all years, as you perceive, not months or days or weeks. You will see also the women of that department 14 years, 6 years, and 9 years, and so on. So in the stuffing department you will find 10 years, 5 years, 6 years; all long services; but these sheets you will have to look through. Again, there are some pages of stuffers, and there are some there marked as apprentices.

5804. Earl of *Limerick*.] Could you distinguish, before another meeting of the Committee between the number of men and the number of boys?

Yes. Then we have some shops for the sake of the poor creatures who are deaf and dumb, though we pay them the same price as we pay other people; we have shops where the deaf and dumb can earn a living, and those you will see here mentioned; 7 years, 5½ years, and so on. Then passing to our carpet planners, even if I take only the first few ones, it will give you an idea as to the employment given by our firm, and whether we are such disreputable people as some people have tried to prove. The first man is 15 years; the next 30 years; then come 14 years, 9½ years, 17 years, 16 years. These are all years, every one of them. I have stated publicly, and I state here publicly before your Lordships, that I believe there is no firm in the world who can show such long service, in comparison to the time we have been employing people each year, and the number we have employed each year. Some of these have not been employed so long as others, from the simple fact that the business was smaller, and it has been growing every day. Now I will take the porters.

The first one is 12 years, then 16 years, then 11 years; 10 years; varying all the way down to 14 years; there is 19 years, 20 years, 8 years, 15 years. Then you come to boys; boys also are employed there when they leave school. Then if you take the carmen you will see 34 years, 20 years, 19 years, 23 years, 18 years, 16 years, 18 years, not months; these are all years. Then you get to the packers; 19 years, 21 years, 14 years, 11 years. I think those sort of things speak more as to the treatment they receive than anything that you can possibly have; that people should work with you for what you may call a lifetime service. And here are our workwomen; carpet women, for instance; 22 years, 13 years, 17 years, 18 years. Then again, the young girls come on, and you will see the length of time they have been. Then here are all the polisher's wages, and the gilding department; then plumbers, labourers, joiners. Some of these joiners, and these sort of people, you will see have not got the length of the service opposite their names, because they work for us, and then they go elsewhere as they are required; in the plumbing department and decorators. Then as regards our salesmen and clerks, you will see them running thus: 44 years is the first, then 17 years, 11 years, 11 years, 23 years, and all quantities of years are attached to the man; you will find on every sheet 28 years, 26 years, 27 years, and that sort of length of service.

5805. How are they on the list; alphabetically?

They are headed at the top by the description of their employment, and then they come alphabetically by their names.

5806. And then they come alphabetically by their names, not according to length of service?

No, not according to length of service, but according to how their name happens to appear in the pay sheets. You will see in some cases it is alphabetical, and in other cases according to how the name appears in the sheet; but with your Lordships' permission I will put in this list, copied from the pay sheets, for your inspection (*handing in the same*). And also, at the same time, I should like to put in these tablets, about which comments have been made, that we put them on articles sold from our premises, insinuations being made that we try to mislead the public. On this one (*pointing*) the Committee will see "From Maple & Co.;" on another "Manufactured for Maple & Co.;" on another "Manufactured by Maple & Co." Then you will see "From Maple & Co., London;" and that shows the ticket to be put on the bedding. So in our carpets of a certain given quality, we have had the name woven in the piece, guaranteeing (we do not make this carpet, and never pretend to) that it is made by some of the best manufacturers. So in the webbing of our chairs, in our own upholstery we use a webbing marked like that (*pointing*). We know, then, if a chair comes back to us, that it was supplied by us.

5807. Earl of *Onslow*.] Could you tell us what these labels mean, "Manufactured for Maple & Co."?

They are sometimes put on to furniture, and sometimes on to bedsteads and other things.

5808. What is the difference between "Manufactured for Maple & Co." and "From Maple & Co."?

Perhaps some of these have been made at a bedstead manufacturer's, or some other place, and the label has been put on there; that is how I account for it.

5809. *Chairman*.] What I understand you to mean is, that on goods you manufacture yourselves you put the label "Maple & Co.," and that on goods that are manufactured for you you put "From Maple & Co."?

That is so in most cases; but, for instance, in some cases there may be "Maple & Co." on things that have not been manufactured on our premises, but still they are things that we are responsible for.

5810. Earl of *Onslow*.] I suppose those that have this label, "Manufactured by Maple & Co.," are manufactured by you?

They are manufactured specially for us, or manufactured by us.

5811. *Chairman*.] Which do you mean?

I mean

I mean both, as I will explain. We have a factory at Islington which manufactures exclusively for us, and it is carried on by Rose, Gorwill, & Day, who have been placed in business by us, and work exclusively for us.

5812. You consider that the same as your own manufacture?

Entirely; they manufacture for no one else, and they use our own materials in all these things.

5813. And these labels, "Manufactured by Maple & Co.," would mean either manufactured on your own premises in Tottenham Court-road or at Islington?

Yes.

5814. Lord *Thring*.] "From Maple & Co." means simply that they come out of your premises?

Yes. Now I will proceed, first of all, with Mr. Arnold White's evidence. He says, "The sweating system, so far as it does exist in the cabinet trade, is still further aided by the practice on the part of some of the great shops, both in Tottenham Court-road and the Curtain-road, of paying the trade working shop the price of the goods delivered, only under a discount, varying from 2½ to 20 per cent."

5815. *Chairman*.] What number is that?

That is at Question No. 2135. The answer goes on: "payment sometimes being deferred on Saturday afternoons until the bank is closed, and as the men require the money, not only for household purposes, but for paying the wages of the *employés* who have been engaged in turning out the work, they have no option but to take the reduced value of their work." Then, further on, in reply to Question 2166, he follows up this remark, and says, "Sometimes in cases where goods have been ordered by so well-known a firm as Maple, a witness will tell your Lordships, under a full sense of responsibility, of this practice of discounts being taken off the prices agreed to be paid for the goods; a very serious statement to make, and I should not venture to repeat it," and he goes on; and then the Chairman asks: "They take discount for cashing their own cheques" (this is in Question 2168), "as I understand you? (*A.*) Yes. (Lord *Thring*.) I understand it to be this: I give a particular man a cheque, and I give it so late that he cannot get it cashed? (*A.*) Yes. (*Q.*) If he could get it cashed there would be no complaint? (*A.*) No, of course not." Then, Question 2171, "If I give it so late that he cannot get it cashed on that particular night, he could get cashed on the Monday morning, I presume? (*A.*) I presume so. (*Q.*) Therefore you allege that for the loan, practically, during the Sunday, the employer charges this large per-centage? (*A.*) That is the allegation." Now that is the first question. He says this man Miller will be produced. Miller is the only one who makes such a statement.

5816. *Chairman*.] You are now going into this question of alleged discounts?

I am going into the question of discounts. I say that that statemant is most direct perjury; the insinuation of Mr. White is slanderous, and I am afraid I must say was delivered, he well knowing it could not be substantiated. Mr. Miller (whose real name is Theodore Müller), was in business some years since, and, as he states, he worked for our firm. Even his first paragraph is incorrect. He says, at No. 2322: "The first goods that I manufactured I took to Maple's." Then, in answer to Question 2398, he says: "It was very difficult (to get work from any other large firm). I had already made an opening in one or two firms before ever I had taken anything to Maples; and when they found, as they called it, that I was under the power of Maples, they refused, or did not care to have anything to do with me." That I shall be able to prove to your Lordships by the evidence that will be called is perfectly untruthful. Miller, at the time that he worked for us, was in partnership with another maker, a man of the name of Wicks; and Wicks I will, with your permission, call, and also Fisher, who was his head managing clerk, he will be called too, and both these people will explain to your Lordships that this is a most unfounded charge. Instead of Miller being, as he says, dependent for money and having to pay us a premium for cashing a cheque, I shall be able to produce evidence to prove that never since our firm has existed has a farthing been charged for cashing one of our cheques.

5817. Whom do you propose to call to speak to that?
My counting-house partner, Mr. Edward Rayner, and Mr. Frederick Coupees.

5818. They will be able to speak on this particular point?
They will be able to speak on the particular point; that they have always had charge of the cashbox in our firm during the last 15 years, one or the other, and that the firm has never charged for cashing a cheque; and not only that, but that we are always willing to make our cheques payable at the counter, and even if in any necessity a man wanted the money quickly, and they had got the cash in the cashbox, they would give him the cash and never charge one farthing.

5819. I do not want to interrupt you, but I will ask you to bear in mind, that if these other gentlemen connected with your firm are coming to give evidence on this subject, and can speak with greater certainty than you can on it, it would be wasting time for the Committee to go over it twice?
But inasmuch as I have been one of the principal signers of the cheques during the last 15 years, having signed ten to one signed by my father, you may take it from me that never have we charged a farthing, and any manufacturer coming to us at any time can always have the money at a moment's notice, and for the last 20 years the firm has never been left for any length of time, not for a day, without a partner being there to sign cheques. As regards this man Miller, who described to your Lordships how he had to go to a public-house to get his cheques cashed, I will adduce here a letter from the City Bank, only a few doors from us in Tottenham Court-road, and these men, Miller and Wicks, had their account at that City Bank. The City Bank write in this way to me in reply to an inquiry from myself; because, when they came and opened so close to us in Tottenham Court-road, they asked me to recommend them business, and I said, would they give any of our people cash for cheques whenever they went to them, and they said they would. I may tell your Lordships that Miller ceased to do business with us in the year 1885, and that we have always closed for many years at two o'clock on Saturday, and it was not until October in 1886 that the banks closed before three; therefore, if Miller wanted change for his cheque he could have taken it to the City Bank. But this is the City Bank's letter to myself, dated the 14th of May. "Messrs. Maple & Co. Gentlemen,—In reply to your inquiry respecting our method of dealing with cheques drawn by your firm and received in payment by various customers" (anyone having an account at that bank), "I beg to inform you that it has always been our practice to treat them as equivalent to cash. Mr. Miller's statement before the Committee on Sweating, is therefore, so far as we are concerned, incorrect."

5820. What is this statement?
Mr. Miller's statement is, that he could not get his cheques cashed; he could not get any money from the bank on account of the cheques, because they were crossed.

5821. Lord *Thring*.] I did not understand it in that way; I daresay I am wrong?
I will read it to you.

5822. Earl of *Onslow*.] I think it is Question No. 2368?
Yes; "Could you not get one of Maple's cheques cashed on Saturday afternoon?—(*A*.) I could when they have been for a small amount. For instance, I have had cheques for 150 *l*. or 200 *l*.; it was impossible for me to get a big cheque like that cashed in a public-house. (*Q*.) A small one you could get cashed? (*A*.) I have got cheques cashed for 80 *l*, when I have had to take a certain amount in paper, in notes, and I have had a certain amount of drink." So you will see in his evidence, reading it through.

5823. Lord *Thring*.] I thought you said that Miller said that he could not get full amount at the bank, and that you read that letter to prove that he did get the full amount?

He

He said in his evidence that he could not get the money from the bank because the cheque was crossed.

5824. Yes, but that was because the bank was not open?
Yes, it was open; but he said it was because the cheque was crossed.

5825. Of course he could not cash a crossed cheque?
I adduce the letter to show that he was able to get the money from the bank, because they always treated our crossed cheques as cash, and passed it at once to the credit of his account.

5826. Earl of *Onslow.*] At what time did the bank close?
At three o'clock on Saturdays then, and never before. We close at two o'clock.

5827. What Miller says on that point at No. 2451 is, "It would be no good; the cheques are printed crossed, and the bank would not pay you the cash?"
Yes, that is his statement.

5828. And you read that letter from the bank to show that the bank would have cashed a cheque even supposing it was crossed?
Yes.

5829. Lord *Rothschild.*] That is to say, supposing he had an account there?
He had an account there until he was pulled up.

5830. Earl of *Limerick.*] If you close at two o'clock on Saturday, your cheques must be issued before two o'clock on Saturday?
Yes.

5831. Lord *Sandhurst.*] Do we understand that the cheque was passed to Miller's account?
Yes.

5832. But could he get the cash for it?
At once; the bank write that letter saying that they always treated, as they promised me they would do, our cheques as cash.

5833. Lord *Thring.*] That is not the practice of a bank; they pass it into the account, and then the customer draws a cheque upon it?
But they pass it to the credit of his account, and allow him to draw a cheque, and give him the money for it over the counter; but the usual way with a crossed cheque is that it has to go to the Clearing House, as your Lordship will know, to be cleared, and after the bank gets the money for it, then it is passed to the credit of the customer.

5834. Earl of *Onslow.*] But you had a special arrangement, I understand you, with the bank that that should not be done?
I had a special arrangement with the bank that they should treat our cheques like a bank note.

5835. Lord *Clinton.*] In order to meet a possible difficulty?
In order to meet a possible difficulty.

5836. Lord *Thring.*] Why do you cross your cheques?
They are printed crossed for safety, for the recipients' sake, not for ours. I sometimes sign as many as 500 cheques a day on our pay days, that is the monthly payment; and they are sent over all the country, and by post. Having received that letter, I turned my attention to the question of the accounts that we had had with Miller, and having all the returned cheques attached to the account, I took one, which I adduce before the Committee, for 314 *l.* 16 *s.* 4 *d.*, which was, as I discovered by the date, given to him on a Saturday, and I asked the bank what had occurred in respect of that cheque. They informed me that when that cheque was paid to them they credited Mr. Miller's account at once with it for the full amount, 314 *l.* 16 *s.* 4 *d.*, and they allowed him to draw 62 *l.* odd in respect of it.

5837. *Chairman.*] Have you got that in writing?

You can have it writing. He only wanted the 62 *l.* for his people, and therefore only drew the 62 *l.*; but it was all passed to the credit of his account.

5838. Lord *Rothschild.*] Was the account overdrawn?
No, but he did not want more for his workpeople that day.

5839. Supposing his account had been overdrawn, what would have happened?
That is banking; I cannot say what the bankers would have done.

5840. Earl of *Limerick.*] There is a perforated date at the bottom of this cheque; is this done by the bank at which Mr. Miller kept his account?
No, that is done by my bank; he paid it into his City bank; that would be perforated by our Union Bank, I should say.

5841. The perforated date would be the date on which it was returned to your bank?
Yes.

5842. Not the date at which it was presented at his bank?
No; the bankers can be called to prove that that cheque was paid in on the 4th November, the date on which it was given.

5843. *Chairman.*] Will you proceed?
Mr. Arnold White goes on to say, in answer to Question 2135, "Mr. Parnell stated that Maple was a sweater of the sweaters A committee was formed in defence of Mr. Parnell, and Mr. Parnell will tell you that the action brought was withdrawn, although he is of course a man of no capital." Mr. Parnell made a statement which I characterised as being perfectly untrue and wrong, and I instructed my solicitors to proceed against him, for, as I said before, we are no sweaters; we do not sweat any *employés* ourselves, nor do we employ any firm who are sweaters themselves.

5844. You are alluding to the action you brought against Mr. Parnell?
Which I was commencing to bring against Mr. Parnell; and my solicitor's letter to Mr. Parnell was as follows, on the 13th of December last: "Sir, we are instructed by our client Mr. J. Blundell Maple, M.P., to apply to you with reference to certain slanderous statements which we are informed you made respecting him at a public meeting held in connection with the Labour Electoral Association for Fulham, in the schoolroom, Walham Grove, on Wednesday evening, 30th ultimo. The statements in question as reported to us, were to the effect that our client, whom you describe as the Tory candidate for Dulwich, was a sweater of the sweaters, and that he compelled his men to work for 12, 14, and 16 hours a day, and sent them home on Saturday with 20 *s.*, 25 *s.*, or 30 *s.* for their week's labour. We are informed that you further stated to the meeting that our client was in the habit of paying his men with cheques, and charging them 2½ per cent. for cashing the cheques. All these statements we are instructed by our client to say, are absolutely unfounded, and are malicious slanders. As we are instructed to issue process at once, we shall be glad if you will let us know the name of your solicitor who will accept service on your behalf." Then my solicitor received a letter from this man, who is a working man, but an agitator, I am afraid, and the secretary of one of these trade societies, and he wrote this to Messrs. Lumley: "Gentlemen, I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter, dated the 13th instant, in reference to certain alleged statements of mine respecting your client, Mr. J. Blundell Maple, M.P., and to say that, as quoted in your letter, they are entirely incorrect, and do not represent what I said. I am, Yours, &c., William Parnell." My solicitor therefore advised me not to proceed further in the action against him, and that is the reason why the action was dropped. Certain statements are made through this evidence of Mr. White's, which show entirely how he strives in every way to attack the firm with which I am connected; for what reason, I cannot say. I have never, that I am aware, had any transactions with Mr. White. He makes a statement as regards our transactions with Baron Edmund de Rothschild, in France, and alleges there that we were guilty of false statements; I think if the Baron were to be asked, no such things would be confirmed. It is true that there

there were two foreigners employed at the château, by ourselves, amongst the many other workpeople; and I am afraid that my firm would have to employ directly some 15,000 or 16,000 people on the premises, if we did all the work ourselves. We cannot do everything, there are a good many things which it is impossible for us to manufacture; and, at times, there will arise occasions when we have to have things made for us; but inasmuch as we take the responsibility of everything that we supply, there is no wrong done to anyone. I have dealt with the subject of the marks put upon the different goods, and therefore it is not necessary for me to refer to the remarks of Mr. White appertaining to the same thing, in which he complains of us. I will ask you to notice, however, what he says in reply to Question No. 2232. Your Lordship asks this Question: "Would it be possible for a house like Maple's, for instance, to do all their work on their own premises?" and his reply to that is: "I do not see the necessity for a house like Maples." That shows the vindictiveness that there is throughout, and the harm that is tried to be done. A house like Maple's should be of great assistance to the nation, and to the working classes. By the way that we bring capital to bear, we produce cheaply, and by the way we concentrate the business together, we are able to carry on the working expenses of the firm, like the stores, at a very low rate; so that we bring into very close connection the working people and the consumers, and by that means, it is my own opinion that both the working classes and the consumers derive a large benefit. That the consumers do derive a benefit, I think, must be acknowledged, it being shown by the enormously increasing business that we do, and by the goods that we supply to all parts of the world. I notice that Mr. White, in reply to the Earl of Onslow's question, at No. 2236: "Has not the result of the establishment of such cheap furniture shops as Messrs. Maples, and others of that character, been very largely to cheapen the price to the consumer?" says: "I think that much favoured person has received some advantages in the point of low price, whether in cheapness or not is another question." And I am convinced, myself, that you will find in going through the whole of his evidence, an amount of animus, and a full intention to do all the damage that he could possibly do.

5845. I must point out to you that Mr. White was then speaking in a general sense, not alluding to your firm only?

May I ask you to look at No. 2236, which is the question for that answer. Our name is mentioned there.

5846. It is a matter of no importance, but Mr. White, as I understand, was then speaking in a general sense?

Only the name of our firm is mentioned there.

5847. He seems to refer to all houses selling cheap kinds of furniture?

Excuse me; but I do not want to detain the Committee on the point. Then, as regards the furniture trade. At Question 2291 Mr. White is asked: "I want to ask you a question as to the system in the cabinet-making trade. I do not understand you to say that there is any great grievance in the cabinet-making trade of an abuse of the contract system; but that the abuse you have in your mind is rather the inability of the cabinet-makers to obtain a sale for their goods after they have made them?" The reply is: "I do not think there is any sort of grievance in the cabinet trade. I only discover the germs of the sweating system in it; there is no widespread discontent; and except in isolated houses, there is not a very widespread cause of evil." So that to our charge, as you see, he lays the idea of being sweaters; he says "isolated," and he is mentioning our name right throughout. Then at Question 2304, in reply to Lord Sandhurst, you see he states that all the other large West End firms are doing with so many less *employés* and having much less work for them; and then he is asked: "Is that because the trade has fallen off, or because they have given their work out." And his answer is: "Not because they have given it out, but because of the spread of the sub-contracting system;" which means to say that these firms are able to do as much work as they did do, with so many less hands. Now I will leave the evidence of Mr. White and go on to the evidence of Miller. As regards Mr. Miller, I have explained to you thoroughly

as to his evidence in respect to the cheques, and I may say that his other statements my partners, and especially Mr. Horace Regnart, will be able to refute. We shall also be able to produce Mr. Henry Fisher, who was clerk with him ever since the commencement, and had in fact nearly all the transactions with Mr. Regnart; and Miller did not have much to do with it. Before I leave the question of Miller's cheque, I see I have got a paper here that perhaps may be of service. We have traced about 210 of the cheques paid to Miller.

5848. Who is that from?

From ourselves; the counting house clerk who will prove this. Four cheques were paid to him on a Monday; eight were paid to him on a Tuesday; seven on a Wednesday; 11 on a Thursday; 72 on a Friday, and 108 on a Saturday.

5849. Who is responsible for that?

Mr. Rayner, and Mr. Coupees, the cash clerks. You will see that he was able on asking for them to have his cheques on any of the days; we did not keep him out of his money in the way he says.

5850. Before you leave this cheque, I see "Saturday" marked on the back of this cheque; what is that?

That refers to the day of the week that the cheque was given out.

5851. Earl of *Onslow.*] That mark was made by somebody in your house; not by the bank?

Yes, not by the bank; it was made since. Mr. Wicks will prove to your Lordships, as also will Mr. Fisher, that the statements, as made by Miller, are thoroughly wrong, I may say, from beginning to end; but that they will deal with. In reply to Question 2327, Miller says that he had to take premises at a heavy rental from Mr. Regnart; that they were only worth about 40 *l.* a year, and that he had to pay 95 *l.* for them. That is also incorrect. The premises have since been let for the same price, and premises exactly the same on one side are let at the present time, and have been let, for 90 *l.*, and on the other side they let for 100 *l.*; therefore, the 95 *l.* a year that he paid for those premises is perfectly good value, and that could be certified to.

5852. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Are those premises belonging to your firm?

No, belonging to Mr. Regnart, as his private property. Mr. Miller, and also Mr. Wicks, went to Mr. Regnart and asked for those premises. I was calling the attention of the Committee to the reply at the end of No. 2327, about these premises of Regnart, that he said that he had to pay 95 *l.* a year for.

5853. *Chairman.*] These are private premises?

Private premises of Mr. Regnart's.

5854. Will he not be able to speak to that?

He will be able to prove that those were let for 95 *l.* a year since, and that like premises on each side were let for 90 *l.* and 100 *l.* respectively.

5855. Earl of *Onslow.*] At that time or now?

Now; and at that time, too, they were. Then at No. 2329, in reply to Lord Rothschild, Miller states that it was "impossible to open an account with other houses." At the same time that he was manufacturing for us, he was manufacturing for a lot of different firms, and the whole list of these firms will be brought again to you to show that that again is a deliberate falsehood. In fact, generally speaking, when firms manufacture for us West End houses are only too delighted to buy the same goods, so that they may have the same things that are sold on our premises. Then I come to a very important statement of his again. He says, in reply to Question 2335, "Yes, on one occasion 100 *l.*" (that he borrowed 100 *l.* from us), "to be paid back 5 *l.* a week, deducted out of the account. He deducted 5 *l.*, and we had to allow him 2½ per cent. for that."

5856. *Chairman.*] Who is the "he"?

It referred to Messrs. Maple and Company; "He deducted out of the account 5 *l.* for two weeks, and on the third week he deducted the whole." That I characterise

characterise as deliberate perjury. He never was lent by my firm 100 *l.*, he never was charged 2 *l.* 10 *s.* for lending it, and he never paid back the 5 *l.* per week. That is a pure case of fabrication. The whole of our accounts can be submitted to any critical test your Lordships may like. It is a deliberate lie. He even goes on to show the way in which this circumstance occurred, and if you will just look at his answer you will see that it is not truthful in the way that he replies. At Question 2356 Lord Thring asks, "He said to you 'You shall pay 5 *l.* every week,' in so many words." This is the reply: "Yes; I might tell you the origin of the 100 *l.* It was this: There was some wood, in the shape of walnut, for sale in the docks; he asked me to go and look at it and buy it; I told him I could not; he said, never mind about the bill, I will meet it when it is due." Now he actually there says himself that he is going to give a bill for it, an acceptance. "I will meet it when it is due." "I had told him I should have a bill due on that date; he said, I will lend you 100 *l.*, and charge you 2½ per cent., and pay me back 5 *l.* a week; so that the payment was to extend over 20 weeks."

5857. Lord *Clinton.*] That "he" must be some individual, not the firm?

That is referring to Mr. Regnart, I have no doubt; most of his transactions were with Mr. Regnart, but Mr. Regnart never pays or advances money; he has nothing to do with our counting-house affairs, and has nothing to do with the signing of cheques; and he also will be able to prove that he never personally lent him any money. The next question put to Mr. Miller is, "What did you say when you were required in the third week to pay the whole; did you not complain?" and the answer is: "When you went to complain you were simply laughed at; you could get no explanation. (*Q.*) What reason did he allege? (*A.*) He would give no reason." Then he goes on and speaks about our paying by this cheque again and taking an extra discount, and so tries to further substantiate what has been a matter of fabrication. Then at No. 2370, if you will notice it, he is asked: "What you contend is that your payments which are due on Friday, or before that, are purposely kept back till Saturday in order that your necessities may enable this percentage to be taken off in cashing?" and his reply is: "Yes, it is the general practice of that firm to do so;" a most deliberate perjured statement, I contend. Then he states also in his evidence that we compelled him to buy things from us by way of contra account, to take goods from us.

5858. *Chairman.*] You mean material?

Material and so on. In reply to Question 2377, "And you think that you could get as good materials cheaper yourself?" he says: "Yes, goods that they invoiced to me at 8 *d.* a foot, for instance, I could have gone and bought at 6 *d.* (*Q.*) Timber? (*A.*) Yes, timber;" and he enters into an elaborate statement. Now, I have had our books examined, and I am able to adduce the whole of the transactions of Mr. Miller with my firm, and the whole of the contra accounts for goods that he bought; and during our trade with him, which extended from 1880 to 1885, ceasing three years since, our total purchases were 23,719 *l.* 4 *s.* 9 *d.*, and the total amount of the contra accounts during the whole of that time came to only 1,137 *l.* 19 *s.* 2 *d.* With regard to the timber account to which he refers, which would be, so to speak, at least one-third of this amount of 23,000 *l.*, he only bought from us to the amount during the whole of those years of 120 *l.* 14 *s.* 10 *d.* The brass-work, that means the locks, brass handles, and different things that we have made in very large quantities at Birmingham (and we prefer to use our own), amounted to 676 *l.* 12 *s.* 5 *d.* bought from us. Some bevel plate-glass amounted to 124 *l.* 18 *s.* 11 *d.* With regard to the tiles we have them made by large quantities, burnt and made at the Potteries, which saves considerably, and we charge these people who are manufacturing for us a very small profit on what they cost, so that the goods may be produced as cheaply as possible, for the sake of the purchaser and also for the sake of the working people. The tiles came during the years 1881 to 1885 to only 152 *l.* 3 *s.* 4 *d.*; he had marble which comes from Belgium to the amount of 28 *l.* 5 *s.* 6 *d.*, and some small things (I suppose for his own household establishment), amounting during the five years to 35 *l.* 4 *s.* 2 *d.*; making a total during the

the whole of the five years of 1,137 *l.* 19 *s.* 2 *d.* His statement is that we compelled him to buy these things from us and charged him an exorbitant price for them. That statement also will be further contradicted by his partner, Mr. Wicks, who was partner with him in all these transactions, and also by Fisher who was with him for so long. You will see, if you like to have all the accounts with regard to Miller, that we buy from him as we buy from other manufacturers. Sometimes a manufacturer makes a price; for instance some of the large screw firms allow from 75 to 80 per cent. off their list. They publish a list of prices, and then they have different discounts off those lists. So with different manufacturers; different manufacturers have different discounts off their list.

5559. What amount of discount did you mention?

Sometimes 80 per cent. The list used to be shown down very low for different people, for retailers, and so on; some sell subject to 50 per cent. discount; that means a large profit for them; others subject to 60 per cent. discount from those lists.

5560. May I ask what kind of people buy these goods without any discount; anybody?

Nobody, I should think. Now as regards Mr. Miller, he had prices for his suites of bed-room furniture. If one suite of furniture is produced, your Lordships quite understand that there is a great saving caused when you can produce half-a-dozen suites of the same pattern. The things are all cut out at the same time, and a man is better able to do the work quickly, and so you find that the saving comes off the price. Now the whole of the discounts, including the extra discounts allowed by Miller to our firm off the 23,719 *l.*, came to 1,567 *l.* 9 *s.* 3 *d.* Those discounts are for cash off the prices that he was in the habit of selling at, not only to us but to other firms, and you will see that his statement is perfectly untruthful again, for the biggest discount that he ever allowed for cash, there were occasions when, I believe, he allowed 15 per cent., which was 10 per cent. over his usual discount, and that was for particular transactions. He wanted to clear a large stock, and my buyer did not require them, and after he had been all round to the other people with whom he did business, and (as Fisher will explain to you) had offered them nearly, if not quite the same terms as he offered to us, he came to Mr. Regnart and offered him 15 per cent., and Mr. Regnart purchased these things from Miller. So that you will see that these statements that are made here by Miller as to 20 per cent., and these sort of discounts being extracted from him, are perfectly erroneous and perfectly untrue. In reply to Question 2508, "What is the largest amount you ever had taken off from any bill?" he says, "22½ per cent." That is wrong, because 15 per cent. was the most, and that was in the transaction to which I just now referred; but, as you will see, the amount of discount, 1,567 *l.* on the purchase of 23,719 *l.*, is equivalent to 6⅝ per cent., and as he was in the habit of always selling goods to our firm subject to a discount of 5 per cent., that means that he has allowed 1⅝ per cent. extra during the different times, as allowance off his regular price at which he would supply to anybody else, just the same as to ourselves. I think if your Lordships would like to ask me any questions that appertain to that witness, this might be the time to do so, because there are so many more here that it is necessary for me to deal with.

5561. I think we would prefer you to continue your statement about the evidence?

Only that while it is all fresh in your memories, you might like to put questions.

5562. Thank you; I think the Committee would prefer for you to continue your statement?

Now I come to Mr. William Parnell, who, as he says, is the secretary of a trade association, and I believe he is also employed at Mr. Whiteley's. Parnell's evidence is very slight, because he has never worked in our firm, or been employed there, or had any transactions with us, and his evidence is altogether hearsay evidence. As my pay sheets will be able to prove, and as also the foremen

foremen in the different departments, the joiners, the upholsterers, and the cabinet makers, or any of the different foremen you like to have will be able to prove the wages that we pay in our firm are as high as the wages paid in any other firm in England, and therefore I need not detain you by going through these remarks as to what Mr. Parnell says. He says here that one man is not getting so much money as he did some years since. I cannot myself speak upon that particular case, because I have not investigated it; but sometimes men have an accident occur to themselves, or they are not so good workmen as they were, or there is some other reason, and therefore they may not earn as much; but that men are paid in my firm as much per hour as they are any where in any of the West End houses, will be proved thoroughly to the Committee. As you see Mr. Parnell propounds a very peculiar sentiment throughout his evidence, that no man should be allowed to work over-time, and he considers that it would be an offence to do so. In reply to Question 2867, he says: "I would make it an offence for any one to work over-time while there was room in the shop for other people to be employed," and as you will see, further on in his evidence, he would cut down the hours of labour enormously so as to supply work for every one. But even Mr. Parnell does in his evidence acknowledge that our system of trading, and those things which he has personally mentioned are carried on by other firms; and as I said before the large and the most progressive firms throughout England all carry on their businesses in the same way that we do; and in no way that I can find do any of them encourage what is known as sweating, or the employment of labour at home at small wages; and all workers who work for these large firms do receive, as you will find, very high wages indeed, such wages as 9 *d.* an hour; and in our firm they work 53½ hours a week. And then, again, your Lordships will understand that in trades like ours, in the cabinet trade, and the polishing trade, and the stuffing trade, and so on, they have continual work you may say from one year's end to the other; they have no exterior work like builders, and bricklayers, and carpenters, and joiners, who work out in the open air, and when there is a wet day, or half a wet day, have to knock off; they make their full time every day, every week; so that their position in a good shop is really, I think, very good indeed; in fact, the only class that to me seem to be suffering are those that are not at work. The present wages are very good, and they have received no diminution. As you will see here by the evidence that will be adduced, even as regards the upholsterers, first class men are able to earn their 50 *s.* a week, and 51 *s.* 3 *d.* for their 53½ hours' work, and that is not a particularly bad pay, considering that it goes on day after day and year after year. I will leave Mr. Parnell's evidence because there is not anything in it, excepting principally hearsay evidence, and there is nothing particular I think that I need trouble the Committee by replying to. There are others to follow me, and I think they will deal with little matters. I now come to Mr. Frederick Charles Baum.

5863. Do you propose to take the various witnesses?
Yes.

5864. Not the various subjects that have been referred to?
No; I am going through the various witnesses now, but I come now to the upholsterers, and if you like I will deal with all these upholsterers now.

5865. You had better take it in your own way?
Thank you, my Lord. Mr. Charles Baum, as you see, says: "I am an upholsterer, and secretary of the London Society of Upholsterers;" and he throughout the whole of his evidence does not complain that he received bad wages from us. He worked for us for some 3½ years, and during that time for the week's work he earned 47 *s.* per week. He did not leave us to go and better himself, to go and get better work, but he left us after 3½ years; and he does not complain of any treatment that he received, but he left us to go and become the secretary of the Liberal and Radical Association at Paddington; and he, being the secretary also to this Upholsterers' Association, it is not necessary for him to earn his daily bread with his hands, and he devotes himself greatly to opposing, I believe, Conservative candidates, going to different constituencies.

He came down to visit my constituents when I was addressing the electors, but I had taken the precaution to have some others there that could have contradicted exactly what he was likely to say, so he did not speak or attempt to; but that was Mr. Baum's reason for coming against me I have not the slightest doubt in my own opinion; and these statements, as I will show, do not say that he was in one iota badly treated while in our employ; they do not say that he earned bad wages, but they only tend to be damaging to us in some other way. He says, for instance, in his evidence, how particular we are that the work should be well done. I would refer you to Question 3071. In his reply there he says: "Messrs. Maple's leather work would equal any work done in any upholstery shop in London; the work is of a most beautiful character, and is certainly equal to any I have ever seen in any shop in London;" and then he goes on in that same paragraph to complain of our employing boy labour. I think in these days, when all are being interested in the technical education of the young, and trying to make them of some use to society, firms should not be blamed for taking young apprentices and teaching them a trade, above all when no premium is taken for these apprentices. These young lads who come to our firm do not get, as he says, 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a week to begin with the first year, but they are taken on in the upholstery department, in the stuffing department, and they receive 3 *s.* the first year, 5 *s.* the second year, 7 *s.* 6 *d.* the third, 10 *s.* the fourth, and 20 *s.* the fifth year. When they have finished their apprenticeship, as our foreman of stuffers will explain to you, a great many of them continue to work for us, and some of them are getting as high as 50 *s.* a week now who, I believe, came in in that way. There is no doubt that the old upholsterers (which has not been clearly set forth before your Lordships), men who belong to these old societies, do grumble that there is a subdivision of labour. We have divided the upholstering trade, which used to be done years ago. Then a man was an upholsterer; he used to stuff chairs, cut a loose cover, make a blind, make a mattress, and all sorts of different things appertaining to the different branches of upholstery. By having large businesses, and also by the subdivision of work, work is better turned out now than it ever was before. A man who goes into the stuffing department as a boy is taught to stuff chairs, and goes through right from the very commencement what they call the webbing, the putting in the springs, the lacing in, and the first upholstery; they go right through the work, and they become stuffers. They are not upholsterers after the old form, they are stuffers; but as stuffers they could go and earn as much wages, if not more, than any of the old upholsterers have ever been able to earn. That is one of the principal complaints, because you see he says in that same passage, "They do not become the all-round professional upholsterer whom I described in the early part of my evidence." No, they are much better stuffers as they are; they can do their work and earn as much money, and generally speaking throughout the year a great deal more money than they ever could the other way. We have in our firm stuffers, mattress makers, upholsterers, blind makers, fixers, and loose case cutters. All those duties used to be carried on by one and the same man in a small house; now they are carried on as separate departments, and it is really for the benefit of the consumer and for the benefit of the working people themselves, that such is the case; but that is what he complains of. And then he says: "In every shop men are hanging about, that is to say, for days they have to stand still waiting for something to come in, which they can earn a week's money upon." It does occur, no doubt, in the old West End houses that a man perhaps may get by piece work, as the witnesses who come will tell you, as much perhaps as 2 *l.* for stuffing a couch, for stuffing which same couch he will not get more from us than 30 *s.*; but then they get continued employment at that 30 *s.* from us, whereas in the other case they are standing about and waiting for a job at 2 *l.* As I shall be able to show you from these witnesses who have worked in our shop, and have left us, and gone to a West End shop and got higher pay by piece-work, in the result they do not earn more. We masters are all friendly, and we have compared notes, and we find that in the result such a man is only taking the same wage per week, on the average, throughout the year, as he got while employed in our firm, and would be getting

getting if he were employed in our firm now; but instead of working as he would work with us steadily, and becoming a man of steady habits, he is getting only, you might say, work for one day or a day and a half, then a little bit of rest. They do not get such permanent work in these West End shops, and it is not so well for them. It is perfectly true that if we could pay them higher wages they would be better off; but we cannot pay them higher wages, and therefore they are not placed in the position of earning much more money than 2 *l.* to 2 *l.* 10 *s.*, or 2 *l.* 11 *s.* 3 *d.*, which is, I think you will find, what our best stuffers earn per week, and that for 53½ hours. Mr. Baum, you will notice, in that same paragraph, refers to 50 years ago, and says that then "It was common to pay 100 *l.* to apprentice a lad to the upholstery trade." Well, surely no one can blame firms like mine for taking these boys in as intelligent boys, educated at the Board Schools, and so to speak giving them a technical education, making them of use directly, and giving them 3 *s.* a week pocket money the first year, then 5 *s.* a week, and so on, and not taking any premiums from them. They were rather to my mind the sort of ideas that are wanted throughout the country, that over the country these technical schools and this technical education should be started, and nothing can better carry out that system than for a lad to get into a good workshop and be taught how to do the work that will earn him the necessary bread, and that without any cost to the nation. Mr. Baum is rather inspired, I am sorry to say, as I said before, by the fact that he is my political enemy; some others are perhaps induced by other considerations, but he goes out of his way here to say something about the high character of our neighbours, with whom we are very friendly indeed, and who carry on their business in the same way as we do. I believe that both Messrs. Shoolbred and our firm have done more during the last 25 years to improve the standing of the *employés* connected with our firms and throughout the whole of the West End, and throughout England, I may say, altogether, than any firms you can possibly find. He says that this firm of Messrs. Shoolbred have always borne a high character for paying their workpeople fair prices. Now Mr. Baum knows as a fact, that Messrs. Shoolbred have shut their doors against society men, and have had a strike, because these society men wanted to, as I think, treat them rather improperly; and, I may say, that during the whole of the time that I have been in Tottenham Court-road (and I may say I have passed from half-past eight in the morning till ten at night there, and I have taken a great interest in the whole working of the place), never have we had a strike in anyone of our departments, and amongst all the different people that we employ, whenever there has been the slightest misunderstanding even, or disagreement, between the *employés* and their foreman, I have always given them a hearing, and it has always been settled satisfactorily to the workmen and satisfactorily to ourselves. Therefore, the stone that Mr. Baum would throw at me, or at my firm, is most unjust, in insinuating that Shoolbreds pay better prices, or that their workpeople earn more; because, such is not the case. I am sorry to say that my friends Messrs. Shoolbred had to lock their shops out against these very society men for whom, I believe, Mr. Baum acts as secretary, and they do not, at the present time, even employ any society men. Then you will notice what Mr. Baum says in answer to Question 3091; he is asked, "Does not that conduce to the cheapness of production," and his answer is, "No. I do not think that the best class of upholstery work is cheaper now than it was 20 or 30 years ago; my impression is, that it has simply increased the profits of the employers." There you are again; he evidently knows nothing about it, or states what is incorrect; because, all things are much cheaper than they were 20 or 30 years ago. The diminution of the price of everything is something considerable since 1874, and that you can also hear. He also actually goes out of his way, in answer to Question 3094, to say this. The question is, "You complained about the way in which the wages are paid under certain circumstances; I suppose the men are quite aware of those conditions when they accept the work, are they not?" and his reply is, "They know that that is the system which is carried on by that firm, and there is a great reluctance on the part of the men to go to that particular firm; it is commonly known as the workhouse in the trade, and men are extremely reluc-

tant to go there." I will ask the Members of this Committee to look at those pay sheets, which I have laid before them, and to notice the time that the *employés* have been employed, and see whether that looks as if it were the "workhouse of the trade." I could bring cases where they have left the firm, and begged to come back again, and been taken back, and they would themselves come and assure you that such statements are perfectly incorrect and uncalled for. The whole of the evidence, from beginning to end, that has been adduced against my firm is tainted and flavoured with the same sauce. It is done for a particular motive; it is done by, I should call them, conspirators, who are trying to do us a harm; but I am certain that, when all our evidence has been adduced, instead of doing us harm it will do us a vast amount of good, because, as I have said before, and I now repeat it again, I believe there is nothing to be found fault with in the working of the establishment. Mr. Baum also says, in his evidence, that men have, through no fault of their own, had to do work again and not been paid for it. I shall be able to call the evidence of the foremen of the departments, and of working men out of the departments, who have been employed on the firm for many years, and they will tell you that these things are most untruthful. That there may have been one case that has slipped through I will not dispute, because that may occur in the best regulated families in a period of so many years. But you will see how this evidence has been got together by these people. Miller never had anything to do with us since 1885. Then the man named Elcock, the transaction to which he refers, and as to which I shall prove that his statement is most untruthful, occurred in 1874. Richards' business with us was from July 1871 until 1879. The evidence that has been brought has been sought for a long way back, I should say, with the hope that our books were destroyed, and that we should be unable to contradict and to disprove these assertions. But we have them all, and I shall be able to show to you all how this conspiracy has been got together. In answer to Question 3144 of Mr. Baum's evidence, he shows clearly that this firm of Messrs. Shoolbred, our neighbours, with whom we are in perfect harmony and work in the most friendly way together, employ their young people in the same way that we do, and still he says that ours is "the workhouse," and that theirs is considered something very superior. He says here, as you will see, something which strengthens the assertion that I made that Shoolbreds do not employ society men. At Question 3147 he is asked, "Can those boys have an opportunity of learning the other portions at the same firm;?" and the answer is, "I believe not; the firm I am speaking of is a firm which, unfortunately, does not employ society men." And this is a society man who says that Shoolbred's, my neighbours, act with every fairness and consideration, and it is considered a fair firm, but our firm is considered "the workhouse;" and still we employ society men; we do not close our shop against any men; we take society men or non-society men; we never interfere with those sort of things, nor do we interfere with their politics or religion. That will close my evidence with regard to Mr. Baum to-day. Do you wish me to go on still further?

5866. Yes, if you please?

I would now take you, which will not take us very long, to Mr. Elcock, at page 382. This evidence will not take me very long to deal with. Mr. George Elcock is called in, and he says that he is a manufacturer. As I have explained to you the transactions to which his evidence particularly refers, occurred in 1874. He says he is a manufacturer; but to his workplace at the present time he hardly ever goes, and he only has one man there at the present time. When I heard that he was going to be called, I could not find that ever such a man had been in our employ as a servant, and I could not find that we had had any transactions since 1874 with any person of that name, and then it was at a different address. However, after his evidence was given, I had that evidence investigated, and here is a letter from one of my solicitors, Mr. Smith, who was then a clerk with my other solicitor, who found out about this particular action. This evidence of his appertains to the treatment that he received from us in respect of a buffet, or sideboard, for 28 *l.*, and he informed your Lordships' Committee here of the conditions under which we refused that article.

article. He goes out of his way to call us "the pioneers in the sweating system," and all that sort of thing; only tarred with the same sort of brush. I should say a great deal of that brush was clogged with the statements they made at the solicitor's office to Mr. White. That, also, I think I shall be able to prove. Mr. Elcock says: "I will refer to the records of the Court and see if I can get it from there. I may say that they did not dispute giving the order or object to the quality of the work or anything of that kind; they relied on the statute, that it was over a certain amount. (*Q.*) They relied on the technical point, that there was no written agreement?—(*A.*) Yes, that is so." That was the exact reply, if you remember. My solicitor, Mr. Smith, examines this case and turns it up; he was then clerk to my solicitor, and this is his letter to me: "Dear Sir, In reply to your inquiry, I have turned up amongst the papers of the late Mr. Seale those relating to the action brought by George Elcock against Mr. Maple, senior. I should mention that at the time the action was heard, viz., July 1874, the late Mr. Seale was the solicitor for the defendant, and that I was managing clerk to Mr. Seale, to whose business I succeeded, and that, consequently, the papers relating to this matter are properly in my hands. I have carefully been through the brief and papers, and it appears from them that the action was for 28 *l.*, the price of a carved oak buffet, and 5 *s.* repairs to a table. The smaller item was paid into Court and the claim for the buffet was resisted on the ground that, although it was to have been delivered in one month from the order, it was three months from the order before it was tendered, and it was then found to be six inches lower than the proper height, the carving was not made in the solid oak, but carved in pieces and fastened on; it had no cellarette" (that is the place where the wine is kept), "and the whole work was of inferior quality. The County Court Judge nonsuited the plaintiff on the ground that he had brought his action in a wrong form, viz., for goods sold instead of claiming for damages for non-acceptance of the goods. I enclose Mr. Alfred Cock's brief" (he is now Queen's Counsel, and he remembers the transaction, and he could be called if you wish), "from which the proofs of the witnesses can be seen, and throughout the brief no reference is made to the Defence of the Statute of Frauds, and I assume from this fact either that Elcock had a written order, or that Mr. Maple did not wish that defence to be raised." And there is the brief (*producing a brief*), and throughout the whole of the brief it will be found that we never defended the action upon that, but that the evidence here is all clearly and properly adduced, that the buffet was not made to its proper size; that it was made at a customer's order; that it was refused by that customer; that it was made of a smaller size than it ought to have been made; that it was made without the cellarette; and that the work was inferior altogether, and, as another maker says, it was not worth more than 20 *l.* The firm never accepted the sideboard; the sideboard, though left on our premises, was taken back to Mr. Elcock. He brought his action in 1874; he had to pay the costs of the action; and yet he comes forward here and makes this statement against the firm, setting forth that we are bad treaters of manufacturers and the working class; and the only case which he adduces is this one, which, as I said before, thank goodness we are able to disprove in its entirety.

5867. Earl of *Onslow.*] Mr. Elcock said that the case was reported and that he had endeavoured to obtain a copy; have you been able to obtain a copy of the report?

No; but the brief is there, and I could read you all the evidence from it.

5868. Lord *Thring.*] Could you say who took the objection that the action was useless, that it was in the wrong form?

I think according to the brief there, which is the brief of our counsel, it looks as if the judge suggested it himself.

5869. You do not know?

It does not seem that we raised it; because if we had raised it, it would have been raised at once, and the time of the Court would have been saved.

5870. I simply wished to know if you knew who actually raised it?
I do not know; but considering that the witnesses were all called, and that there are the counsel's notes there as to evidence given, it shows clearly that the case was not non-suited on the action of my barrister, because my barrister would have at once proceeded to mention such a thing.

5871. Earl of *Derby.*] The case was tried on its merits?
On its merits. It was tried on the merits, and Mr. Elcock was condemned in all costs. That I think is the principal evidence which I have to deal with as regards Mr. George Elcock. I shall have to deal with the evidence also of some others; and, in fact, I am sorry to say that in order that I may put myself right with this Committee, and with the country at large, I feel compelled to show up this conspiracy which has been made; and in that view I would ask kindly to have certain witnesses called, whose names I will give, whose evidence will go to strengthen these statements.

5872. You propose to continue your statement on Tuesday?
With your permission.

The Witness withdrew.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Martis, 26° Junii, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of CANTERBURY.
Earl of DERBY.
Earl of ONSLOW.
Viscount GORDON (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord CLINTON.
Lord CLIFFORD of CHUDLEIGH.
Lord FOXFORD (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord ROTHSCHILD.
Lord MONKSWELL.
Lord THRING.

LORD KENRY (EARL OF DUNRAVEN AND MOUNT-EARL), IN THE CHAIR.

MR. JOHN BLUNDELL MAPLE (a Member of the House of Commons), is further Examined, as follows:

5873. *Chairman.*] You have something to add to the statement you were making last Friday?

Yes. I would now ask you to refer to the evidence adduced on the 8th of May, on page 310, in reply to Question 3171 and the following questions. It is in the evidence of Henry Miller. The Chairman commences: "I want to ask you one or two questions arising out of your evidence the other day as to the matter of discount and the payment of cheques to you. You stated, I think, that the discount was sometimes up to 10 per cent., and sometimes as high as 20 or 25 per cent?" The answer is: "20 to 22½ per cent." Now, that we shall be prepared to show is altogether incorrect. There is but the one transaction where 15 per cent. was taken off, 10 per cent. over and above the usual 5. Then, in answer to Question 3172, he says this: The question is, "I do not understand that you object to the fact that the discount was charged, but to the fact that you did not know what the discount was going to be; is that so?" and the reply is: "I knew what the discount should be; according to the agreement, it should be 5 per cent. (*Q.*) Which you do not object to?—(*A.*) No, not the 5 per cent. (*Q.*) What you object to is a larger discount being charged than you were led to suppose would be the case?—(*A.*) Yes; had I known that the discount that was taken off was going to be taken off, I should never have attempted to have made the articles." Now that is a deliberate falsehood, and both his partner, Mr. Wicks, and Fisher, as also Mr. Regnart, my junior partner, are prepared to come forward before this Committee and prove that those statements are false. Then Question 3175 is: "Then I understood you also that you were obliged to submit to this discount owing to the fact that the cheques were given to you so late on Saturday that you could not get them cashed?" and the answer is: "Not that I could not get them cashed, but the amounts were too large, so that they had to be cashed in the counting-house," implying thereby that in our counting-house we cashed these cheques, that they were large, and we cashed these cheques. Question 3176 is: "You do not mean that they were too large to be cashed in the bank?" The answer is: "I could not cash them in the bank, because every cheque given to me was printed crossed." Question 3177 is: "Did you ever ask to be paid by an open cheque?" The answer is: "No, I did not. (*Q.*) Why did you not?

not?—(*A.*) At the beginning of my business I could always get them cashed; sometimes, when I did not wish them cashed anywhere else, I could cash them in a public-house, the 'Lord Palmerston.' (*Q.*) Small cheques only, do you mean?—(*A.*) No; sometimes I could go with a large amount. If the landlord had not the cash in his place, he would not do it, but generally I could cash them there. (*Q.*) Do you keep a banking account book?—(*A.*) I did at one time, at the beginning part of my business. With the capital I started with I did have a banking account; but if I paid a crossed cheque into the banker's, you could not draw on a crossed cheque, not at once; they would necessarily want the cheque cleared. (*Q.*) Do you mean that your bank would not advance you any money on the crossed cheque of Messrs. Maple?—(*A.*) They would do so, but, as a rule, they would not." Your Lordships have had before you the letter from the City Bank, wherein they say that they always were willing, and always did do that. Therefore that, you see, is altogether incorrect.

5874. Earl of *Onslow.*] What have you to say about this question of their being cashed in the counting-house; you said that the Witness implied that they were cashed there, but I did not hear you deny the statement?

There might, on a few occasions to oblige him, have been a cheque cashed; but never has a cheque been cashed in our counting-house and a farthing ever charged for cashing the same. Our cash-books, in fact all our books, are at the disposal of the Committee or anybody that they like to depute to examine them. Unless my cash clerks are fraudulent cash clerks, which I have no reason to believe, moneys that they received would be entered in the cash-book; and no such entry could be found. Therefore that is altogether untruthful. What he wished to convey to your Lordships was (one of the Members of your Lordships' Committee called my attention to that) that these cheques were cashed in the counting-house. There was no need for that; as you have seen, he had this banking account, and any of our cheques we could always make open to pay at counter, and as our premises were closed at two o'clock always on Saturdays and the banks not until three, and the Branch Bank where we banked in Argyll-place, Regent-street, is not a quarter of an hour's walk from Tottenham-court-road, if the last moment that we are open, namely, at two o'clock, he had a cheque, at a quarter past two he could be at the bank to get the cheque cashed. In reply to Question 3194, "But were not the banks open till three at that time?" he said, "Yes, but as I have explained before, the cheques were all crossed; you could not cash them at the bank." So you see it is in a most deliberate and determined way that he sticks to this statement of his. You have the bank letter saying that this is untrue. I would now take your Lordships to page 425, Peter Van Damme's evidence; and I think before I have done dealing with all these witnesses you will see that these statements have been prepared by certain solicitors, and they have been placed in the hands of different people to read. Mr. Van Damme used the word "defrauded."

5875. Where is that?

In answer to Question 4371, and it is done in such a way as to bring a great amount of damage to our firm. The Chairman there puts this question, "You have stated that you have been at one time defrauded by the firm of Messrs. Maple and Company, and you propose to give some instances; and you said, also, that the way in which you had been treated, in your estimation affects the whole trade generally. I daresay you will explain that later on to the Committee; in the meantime, will you give the Committee the instances which you wish to put before them. You have a statement before you, I understand, which you can read to the Committee?" and then he reads. I have brought down a number of invoices for this Committee, and I shall be happy, in nearly all late cases, to show every invoice from any one of the people making these statements against us, the separate invoices. I may say that some of these people who have been called are people who sold us goods so long ago that the invoices have been destroyed; but here is a case which only deals with the time from 1882 until 1887, and therefore I can adduce every invoice against every cheque that he has had, and your Lordships will see that the whole of the allowances taken

taken from his invoices amount to 6 *l.* 5 *s.* in the total on the whole lot, besides the 2½ per cent. discount; and this 6 *l.* 5 *s.* is allowances taken off goods. In one case, on one invoice, there is 25 *s.*, and on another invoice there is 5 *l.* That 5 *l.* refers to the chairs mentioned in the answer when he complains that we took him off a price from these chairs because he wanted the money.

5876. *Chairman.*] Do you mean the 12 chairs?

The 12 chairs referred to, on the 14th of August. Now I will give you the invoice and you will see; and, strange to say, those chairs I am able to prove were badly carved, badly made, and I regret to say they are in our stock at the present time, and though we paid him this bad price that he complained of, I shall be happy to lose 10 *s.* a chair frame off each of those chair frames; so that that can easily be proved as to that particular thing.

5877. You observe that the Witness here says, "I contracted verbally;" is that correct?

I have no doubt that he arranged to make the chairs to a certain quality, and in a certain pattern, and when those chairs came in I should say they were not up to the quality and not to the pattern, or he would have been paid his price as everybody else is.

5878. I want to call your attention to this. He said, "I contracted verbally to deliver to Mr. Maple 12 chairs"?

Yes, I see that in his evidence.

5879. When you speak of "invoices"; I want to know what is meant by that?

When the goods are brought to the house they are accompanied by an invoice, and then on this invoice it was not 12 chairs, but 10 chairs, as your Lordship will see, and they are charged at 46 *s.* each.

5880. But later on I see the witness says: "I received a verbal order from Mr. Dent, Mr. Maple's buyer, in August 1886, for 10 chairs;" can you tell us to which set of chairs you are alluding?

I am alluding to those where the deduction was made. He seems to have got off the lines somewhat here, because there was no deduction made on any 10 chairs that we had received from him excepting those 10, and there is no deduction made on any 12.

5881. I ask how you can identify, by the invoice you have, these particular chairs which the witness says he contracted verbally to deliver?

He says here: "In spite of this declaration, he refused to pay me more than 36 *s.*," the price that, with the 10 *s.* off, they come to.

5882. Earl of *Onslow.*] That must apply to the first lot, because the first lot was invoiced at 2 *l.* 5 *s.*, and the second only at 35 *s.*?

Yes. He says: "On the first occasion, in 1883 or 1884, I contracted verbally to deliver to Mr. Maple 12 chairs, at the price of 2 *l.* 5 *s.* per chair, from samples shown. When I delivered the 12 chairs Mr. Maple himself declared he did not know me. After complaining, I took the chairs away, when he sent a boy after me, and offered me 35 *s.* for each chair, which I refused to give him." Evidently there was no transaction there.

5883. *Chairman.*] Those are not the chairs you are speaking of?

No, because this invoice was in 1886. He then goes on: "On the second occasion I received a verbal order from Mr. Dent, Mr. Maple's buyer, in August 1886" (that is this thing), "for 10 chairs in Italian walnut, from a pattern chair which I had delivered at 35 *s.*"

5884. Those are the 10 chairs in that invoice before you?

These are the 10 chairs here.

5885. And you say that is the invoice for the 10 chairs which he received a verbal order for?

Decidedly. He goes on to say: "I told Mr. Dent I could not repeat them at this price. His answer was, that 'the price was no object to him

him if the workmanship and material were of the finest quality, as they had obtained an order for them.' In spite of this declaration he refused to pay me more than 36 *s.*" (His statement does not run quite correct, as you see.) "These chairs cost me 2 *l.* each." Those are the chairs that he complains that Mr. Dent would not pay him more than 36 *s.* for.

5886. Lord *Thring.*] How do you identify the invoice?

By the date of August, and the price of the chairs; and there are no other deductions taken off the whole of the statements. (*The invoice is handed in to the Committee.*) The invoice is 10 chairs at 46 *s.*; then overcharge on each of the chairs of 10 *s.*, amounting to 5 *l.*, reduces the 23 *l.* to 18 *l.*

5887. Who is the "overcharge" written by?

By Mr. Dent, the manager in that department. Then there is the 2½ per cent. discount off, 9 *s.*; and when he brought these chairs in, and the matter was in dispute (and you will see by the answer here that he said he could not cut his chairs up, or pay them away), we even allowed him to have 15 *l.* on account at once, and then he had the balance of 2 *l.* 11 *s.* on a later date, and receipted the invoice. I want your Lordships to see that it is perfectly straight.

5888. *Chairman.*] And those, you say, are the 10 chairs mentioned?

Those are the 10 chairs mentioned; and not only that, those 10 chairs are in our stock at the present time. At this point, perhaps it would be advisable for me to notice that some of the witnesses in different parts of their evidence say that they have not had a written order. At Question 4390, Mr. Van Damme is asked by Lord Monkswell: "You have never got a written order, and never asked for one?" and his answer is: "On some orders I have had written orders." Our firm is always very happy to write any orders, and we have order forms, but if men do not think to ask for them, and the salesman has to go round to his office, 100 yards or 200 yards off, to write out the order form, and it is not required, it is not given; but whenever they are asked for, orders are always given, and we have order books regularly. So that upon that line I think your Lordships will see that as some say that they can have orders whenever they like, and as others say that they have not had them, it means simply that the latter have not asked for them, and it is no fault of my firm, or of the employés therein. That is the principal part of Mr. Van Damme's evidence, who states that he has been defrauded. The whole of his invoices are there before you of every transaction we have had with him, and the total allowances come to the sum of 6 *l.* 5 *s.*, of which I have now explained 5 *l.* The others you will see on the invoice; one is a question of 10 *s.*, and the other of 15 *s.* I would now take your Lordships to Mr. Dickson, and he has been sought out, as I shall be able to show to your Lordships these other witnesses have been sought out. Our business transactions with Mr. Dickson, or rather with his father, existed so many years since that it is impossible for me to turn up all his invoices, but I have brought particulars from our bought ledgers. The business to which Mr. Dickson refers, at least the only business we have to do with Mr. Dickson, which was with his father——

5889. Will you explain what you mean by the bought ledgers?

We keep ledgers against our customers, and the bought ledgers show what we buy ourselves, so that the whole of the transactions with the people we buy from, all the invoices and all the cheques, the way in which they are settled, is always in those bought ledgers. They are called bought ledgers, and the others are the sold ledgers. Mr. Dickson was, at the time that we had any transactions with him, our transactions were really with his father; the Mr. Dickson that we dealt with is dead, I believe; but the transactions to which this young man refers occurred between September 1874 and May 1875. I am sorry that we have not got all the invoices in connection with it, but I will show that we had no dispute with Mr. Dickson, the father, and that he had only eight transactions with us, and the total amounted to only 979 *l.* 6 *s.* 2 *d.*; those are the transactions we had with Mr. Dickson. He is asked at Question 4395: "Have you anything, any special point, you wish to bring out

out before the Committee as regards your trade?" and his answer is, "Thirteen years ago Messrs. Maple threw upon my hands goods for which they had given me orders to the extent of 420 *l.*, the sole reason for their doing so being our refusing to take from the agreed price 2 *l.* 2 *s.* 6 *d.* from one table, and one sovereign from the agreed price of a wardrobe, being altogether 3 *l.* 2 *s.* 6 *d.* Because we refused to take that off, Mr. Regnart, the gentleman who still has the management of the department, said, "I will not take any of your orders," and he did not take it, and we have done nothing for them since; and we had to dispose of that 420 *l.* worth of orders at a great deal of disadvantage and in the best manner we could." Now Mr. Regnart will tell you that this is most incorrect and most untrue. Mr. Regnart's impression is that he was asked by the father to go and see——

5890. Had not this better come from Mr. Regnart?

I thank your Lordship; but it was only that I was going to show that that evidence also, if you will read it, is got up as one of the only cases that they could find against our firm during the last 40 or 50 years which could throw any doubt upon the honesty of our trading.

5891. Before you go on to another witness, do you leave the other invoices in connection with Mr. Van Damme?

I leave them all there.

5892. These are all the invoices you have?

Everyone, and every transaction. I would now take your Lordships to the evidence of Mr. Henry Waltham, who, as you will see, was never employed by our firm, and who is secretary to the London Upholsterers' Trade Society. His evidence is to be found on page 431, commencing with Question 4429. He complains, in reply to Question 4430 (that is rather a statement which follows) of the introduction of that apprentice or boy labour to which I referred, and perhaps now it would be as well for me to give you a complete list of the boys under 18 years of age amongst our workpeople.

5893. Are they included in the list you handed in the other day?

Yes, but at the request of Lord Limerick I was to prepare a complete list. Out of the 1,295 men and boys employed in what may be called the workshops and manufacturing portions of our business, the total number of boys under 18 years of age amounts to 69, and they are as follows: 13 boys with the carmen, six with porters, 14 in the stuffing department, two with the cabinet makers, 11 with the polishers, six with the mattress makers, one with the gilders, two with the plumbers, two with the joiners, five in the upholstery department, two in the carpet planner's, five in the decorating, none with the packers, and none with another cabinet shop; making a total of 69. Looking at this statement of Mr. Waltham's, your Lordships will see that it is also done with that particular sauce which shows the same handwriting which has prepared all these statements. He says: "This firm has always borne the reputation of a sweating house, and, as a fact, no upholsterer ever thinks of applying for work there unless he has exhausted every other channel, and even then only when every other resource has failed." Then in this statement he refers to a correspondence which he had with myself. He says: "In reply to Mr. Blundell Maple's challenge and denial of the charge of sweating made in his speech at Dulwich, on 23rd November 1887" (this is at the bottom of his answer to Question 4430). Then at number 4431 the question is: "You are speaking of your own knowledge in the statement you have made?—(*A.*) Yes, entirely of my own knowledge. I have ample means of verifying every word I state." Then in the next question Lord Thring asks: "Is it from hearing what other workmen tell you that you make these statements, or from individual experience?" The answer is, "Not from individual experience, but from facts that have been brought before me in my official capacity by workmen." So that it is hearsay. Then he says, in reply to Question 4435, which is: "And what you state will be supported by evidence?" "Yes. Mr. Blundell Maple, in his speech at Dulwich, made a challenge and denial of the charge of sweating." Now, I have got the correspondence which I had with this gentleman, and, as he says, I made a speech

on the 23rd of November 1887. It was not until, I think, the 6th of February (the letter is dated the 4th February) that I received a letter from this Mr. Waltham. It runs in this way: "Dear Sir,—A copy of your speech at Dulwich, on November 23rd ult." (that was about three months previous), "together with a declaration signed by the foreman of your upholsterer's stuffing department, has been brought before the notice of this society. I am instructed to inform you that the statements contained in both the speech and declaration are in direct opposition to the truth, and that it is the duty of this society to contradict the same. Wishing, however, to avoid any conflict between capital and labour, we should be pleased to show you (if desired) that the system which obtains in the stuffing department of your firm is the reverse to what you state, and which sooner or later must cause a rupture in the friendly feeling that should exist between employers and employed. Trusting this letter will command your attention, I remain, &c." To that I replied as follows (it was on the 6th of February that I received his letter): "Dear Sir,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 4th of February addressed to me by yourself, as secretary of the London Upholsterers' Trade Society. I am glad that your society recognise that a friendly feeling does exist between Messrs. Maple and Co. and their *employés*, which is quite true, and I quite agree as to the inadvisability of anything being done which sooner or later must cause a rupture between employers and employed. In the first paragraph of your letter you call my attention to a speech made by myself in Dulwich on the 23rd of November, but you do not forward me the copy of the report upon which you write, nor do you send me a copy of the declaration 'signed by the foreman of our upholsterers' stuffing department,' the statements in both of which you designate as 'in direct opposition to the truth.' While being at all times anxious to listen to the opinions formed by trade societies, I can but feel that trade societies are delegating to themselves powers and rights to which they are not entitled when they interfere between employers and their employed, unless there is any disagreement or dispute. At the present moment I am not aware of any disagreement existing in our firm between the workpeople and our foreman and working partners, nor has any such misunderstanding, to my knowledge, existed during the last 12 months, if not more. This applies to the many hundreds of workpeople in all the different branches in connection with our firm. As I have at all times explained, and as events have proved, whenever or should ever any misunderstandings arise, it has been and will be my anxious endeavour to investigate the matters, and hitherto I have the satisfaction of knowing that, during the last 20 years in which I have been actively engaged in the business, I have been able so to arrange all misunderstandings that I believe in no firm in England has a more friendly feeling existed between employers and employed than, during that time, has existed between our firm and those therein engaged. Please oblige by replying to this letter and sending me copies of the documents you referred to." On the 8th of February a letter was written in reply to that to me. "Dear Sir,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 6th inst., and will lay the same before the above society at the earliest possible date, and their reply will follow in due course." I then received no communication until the very end of that month, about three weeks after that, when I got a letter which is as follows: "Dear Sir,—Replying to your letter of the 6th inst., I am instructed to forward you copies of the speech and declaration referred to, also to say that this society fails to see any reason for altering its opinion, and, moreover, are prepared to substantiate their assertion." To that letter I did not reply, and I had a letter on the 24th of March calling my attention to it; but really, considering the smallness of the society, and that there were really no charges made that required refutation, I did not think it necessary to carry on a correspondence further.

5894. Then what Mr. Waltham says is correct, that you did not acknowledge the receipt of his letter?

In that sense, that I have not replied to the letter; but that is the correspondence, and there is no question given me to reply to; and Mr. Waltham's statement

statement at the end of answer to Question 4435 is very wonderful: "In short, it is the experience of our society that all the sweating from which our trade suffers is traceable to Messrs. Maple and Co., and they recognise the fact that the existence of such firms is demoralising to the workmen, unfair to the customer, and dangerous to the State." That has been prepared, as you see. Then, in reply to Question 4437, he falls out with Mr. Baum, who, in his evidence, said what beautiful work was done in our upholsterers' shops. He tries to say that our work is not satisfactory, not done well; but as Mr. Waltham never lived on our premises, and Mr. Baum did and worked there, I think Mr. Baum's opinion after three and a half years is more valuable where he says at the bottom of page 300: "Messrs. Maple's leather work would equal any work done in any upholstery shop in London. The work is of a most beautiful character, and is certainly equal to any I have ever seen in any shop in London." Therefore, I think you will see that Mr. Baum's opinion upon that is better than Mr. Waltham's. That is my reply to the remarks in Mr. Waltham's evidence. Now I think, with your Lordships' permission, I had better refer to the evidence of a gentleman, Mr. Thomas Clarke, on page 430. It is necessary for me to call attention to the fact of what evidence has been adduced before you, and to the way in which it has been adduced.

5895. If you wish to contradict any of the statements made by Mr. Clarke, we will hear what you have to say on his evidence?

I will think that over, and perhaps come back to it. I have said that I think your Lordships will find that a conspiracy has existed, and it is necessary for me to show how that conspiracy was formed, and the reasons of its formation; and, therefore, it is necessary for me to take you at the present time to the way in which Mr. Arnold White and his solicitors have been acting together in respect of getting together this evidence, and the class of evidence that has been collected together, searched for ever so far back. I wish to put in some letters written by these solicitors to different people, asking them to come forward to give evidence against ourselves. I shall also be prepared to show the Committee that in statements that have been made to those solicitors, including other people's names, and so on, have been altered, and only our own name referred to; and the statements have been altered in the office of the solicitor, and words inserted, and those statements have been laid before this Committee.

5896. What do you want to prove by this?

I want to prove that the whole of this has been got up by Mr. Arnold White and others for the purpose of damaging our firm in every way that is possible; that they have searched for these witnesses; that Mr. Miller has been in the pay of Mr. Arnold White, and been receiving 50 *s.* a week, and offering 2 *s.* 6 *d.* an hour to get these people to come forward.

5897. As I understand you, you wish to prove before the Committee that there is some motive, some conspiracy against your firm?

That is it; that is what I said before.

5898. And that the evidence that has been given before the Committee, in so far as it refers to your firm, is the result of a conspiracy against it?

Yes.

5899. Lord *Thring.*] Do you allege specific acts of bribery or corruption?

I allege that these people have been in the pay——

5900. Do you allege that money has been paid to them in order that they may give false evidence?

No, that is too strong; I cannot allege that. I can allege that 2 *l.* 10 *s.* per week has been paid to one man who has acted as agent, and offered 2 *s.* 6 *d.* an hour to other men to come forward and make statements.

5901. *Chairman.*] I do not understand clearly. You do not, as I understand you, deduce from these facts that witnesses have been bribed or paid to give untrue evidence. I merely want to know what it is that you wish to prove?

I wish to prove before this Committee, and I think I shall be able to prove before this Committee, that Mr. Arnold White, and those working with him, have

have gone about, and through their agents, through this man Miller, have tried to get information, any little thing against us, so that they may prejudice our name and connect us with the sweating system.

5902. Supposing you establish that fact, what do you deduce from it?
The only persons whose interest it has been to make these statements which I am one by one proving before your Lordships to be untrue (for instance, Miller's evidence itself, I contend, is most perjured) would be Mr. White and those working with him.

5903. Lord *Thring.*] But do you allege a corrupt intention; do you propose to prove that Mr. Arnold White had a corrupt and fraudulent motive in bringing these charges?
I cannot prove that exactly; I can only show you the facts of the case.

5904. *Chairman.*] Do I understand that you have finished disproving the facts stated against you?
No; there are lots of other facts besides.

5905. Would it not at any rate be more convenient if you confined yourself now to disproving the facts?
Very well, I will do that, and then raise the question afterwards for your Lordships' consideration.

5906. Lord *Thring.*] Do you allege that Mr. Arnold White paid excessive sums to these witnesses?
I do.

5907. Beyond what they would have received if they had not come?
Half-a-crown an hour is beyond.

5908. That is a matter of opinion?
It is a matter of opinion. I will now turn to the evidence of Mr. Brown on page 433. Mr. Brown, as your Lordships will see, was with us eight years since, and if you will read his evidence through carefully you will find again what I state, that it is worded wholly and solely against our people. At Question 4483 he is asked: "They (the employed) are too many and too poor?" (to make a bargain for themselves), and his reply is: "They are too poor; I will not say they are too many, because all workers, in my opinion, have a right to live, and I will never say they are too many. They may be too poor to fight their battle, but that is no reason why they should be continually sat on as they are by Messrs. Maple and the like. That is the only firm I have mentioned, because that is the only firm where men have been sat on, or tried to be cheated." The remark there shows exactly the intention of trying to damage us. You will hear from our foreman upholsterer, and from others of our working men that have been in our firm some years, and are now working with us, that they do not consider that the wages that we pay are bad wages; in fact, a man earns as much or more with us than in any other firm in London. It is true that in piece-work we sometimes do not pay the same amount for the stuffing of a couch, or an easy chair, as some of the West-end firms; but we give such continued employment that they are able in the year to earn as much money. This man, Mr. Brown, is with a most respectable firm at the West-end, and that firm have shown the earnings by him during the last 12 months, and it comes out to an average of 50 *s.* a week.

5909. *Chairman.*] You are alluding to transactions with another firm?
Only saying that Mr. Brown is earning now at the rate of 50 *s.* a week, the same as he would be earning with us.

5910. On what authority do you mention that?
I will mention the firm's name if you like; Messrs. Howard.

5911. I understand you to say that this firm with whom he is at the present time have made some statement?
They have given that information to us.

5912. If

5912. If they wish to give that information to the Committee they must do it themselves?
Very well, my Lord.

5913. If you have got a written letter from them, that will do?
I can send your Lordships a written letter if that is what you consider necessary. With regard to other remarks as to the treatment by our foreman, the foreman will perhaps reply to them, but you will find that they are perfectly wrong and made with the vindictive spirit in which the whole of the evidence, as I contend, has been given. Now I come to the evidence of Mr. Shaughnessy, at page 441. He also was a working upholsterer in our firm. He tries to make out that the firm is bad, but still he came to work with us for a few weeks and found out all about the firm in 1880, and he then returned to the firm and continued to work for it for some three and a half years. His earnings I have before me, all his weekly earnings for the different weeks, and you will see generally speaking that he was placed in a position where he could earn about 50 *s.* per week.

5914. Is this contradictory of any statement he has made?
Contradicting his statement as to himself.

5915. What statement?
He says here that we are bad paymasters. In the evidence generally, you will see that he says that we are bad paymasters, and that he wishes that he had never been in the place.

5916. I see as a matter of opinion he says, that Messrs. Maple's is the worst shop he has ever worked at, and things of that kind?
That is it. I can prove against that statement, that when he was unwell, after working at our place for some months; in fact he commenced with us on the 10th of September 1883; that is the second time that he was with us; and in August 1884 he was unwell, and when he came back, as our foreman will tell you, previous to his going he was treated with great kindness, and he came back and was placed in a position to earn his 2 *l.* 10 *s.* a week right away from that time, and he continued with us for these three and a half years; which hardly suggests that it is a very hard-working shop, that he should be there three and a half years afterwards. But that point again I will leave to my foreman of upholsterers to deal with. Then as regards Mr. William Adams on page 450, I hardly think that it is necessary for me to call your attention to his evidence, because his evidence is worded again to do us damage in such a way. He complains that Mr. Fuller could not get money from us, and therefore that he was not paid and could not get his money; and that is evidence which again shows the spiteful nature of the whole of the evidence that has been brought before you. I now come to the evidence of Mr. Harry Ham, on page 374. He is General Secretary of the Alliance Cabinet Makers' Association, of which Mr. Parnell is the Secretary of the West-end branch. These two men, as also some of the other witnesses that have been called before you, are secretaries of these trade societies, and get very well paid. Mr. Ham has been connected with these sorts of agitations. He refers to the boy workers again, and objects to our employing boy workers. He also refers here to our treatment of a manufacturer; but that treatment goes as follows, about the three manufacturers at the West-end being consulted.

5917. In what Question is that?
In reply to Question 3787. He refers here to the three cabinet makers: "They were asked to send in two or three suites each as a specimen of their work" (this is also hearsay evidence entirely which the Committee took), "and on a certain day they were to attend at the firm, when a committee of inspection from the railway authorities attended to inspect the goods sent in." But all that evidence is but the same evidence as was given by Mr. Richards, who is the man who is supposed to have suffered from that particular treatment.

5918. I do not quite understand; do you say that this did not occur?

I say that this statement here is dealt with by John Boswell Richards, who is the manufacturer who makes this complaint, and that this complaint is made by Mr. Boswell Richards to Mr. Ham, and he brings it out to you in this way.

5919. You do not traverse the statement?

I will traverse it altogether in Richards' evidence; that is what I meant to convey to your Lordships. Mr. Ham acknowledges that the wages are higher than they were 20 or 25 years since, but he says that they have to work much harder, and, in fact, he draws a wonderful description of their having to divest themselves of everything but shirt, trousers, and stockings. But, considering all the hard work that is now done by steam saws, steam planes, and so on, that hard rough work that used to necessitate the removing of the clothing is now done away with; so that is hardly correct. He then also tells you this in reply to the Earl of Aberdeen's question, No. 3833: "Has there been an alteration in the average length of hours during the last 10 or 20 years?"—"Not to any extent; the only point where we have reduced the hours is this: 20 or 25 years ago we had to leave off at six o'clock of a Saturday, then 12 or 14 years ago we brought down this to four o'clock, and about nine or 10 years ago we brought it down to two o'clock." So that you see that the working men are able, and have been able, in the cabinet makers' societies, and so on, to have reduced hours of work, and also increased pay per hour. Mr. Ham's answer to Question 3849 is this: "I think it is certainly wrong, looking to the future of the trade, for any employer to bring up any number of youths, so that when they arrive at manhood there is not a chance of a decent living. (*Q.*) Then you would limit compulsorily the numbers in the trade?—(*A.*) Just so. (*Q.*) In order that there might not be more in it than would be reasonably certain of finding employment?—(*A.*) Just so. (Lord *Clinton.*) Or you would have them regularly apprenticed for a certain time?—(*A.*) That would be by far the best course. (*Q.*) So that they might learn the trade?—(*A.*) Yes. (Earl of *Derby.*) But even so, I presume you would limit the number of apprentices for the reason that you have given already?—(*A.*) Yes. (Earl of *Aberdeen.*) Would it be fair to assume that one reason why the middleman has sprung into existence is that formerly the workman did not exert himself as much as he might have done, did not take off his collar and waistcoat, as you told us just now?—(*A.*) I should think not. (*Chairman.*) How many apprentices would you allow one journeyman to have?—(*A.*) We have no rule in our society bearing on that; but there is a common understanding that no one in our society should employ boy labour, with the exception of his own son." You see this old society would like (and that is what these societies would like to do), to keep the work in the hands of their own particular society.

5920. You do not agree with the witness in that?

I do not agree with the witness that it would be fair to the young and rising generation that they should not be apprenticed and taught a trade for the sake of keeping the wages of the working man above what is their proper standard. These wages are very high as you will hear; 9 *d.* an hour is good wage, and they should not object to boys being taught to work in a line where perhaps they may go abroad (because there is large room for cabinet makers abroad), and earn a good living; in fact the cabinet making and the upholstery trades are the best schools for the future young fellows to be educated in. Whether they go to the Colonies or to America, they will always be able to get work if they have been taught their trade. Then Question 3858 is: "You would allow the employer to have a certain number of apprentices but not the journeymen"? and the answer is: "Yes; in the shop where I was apprenticed in the country, there were only two journeymen, and always five or six apprentices going, and the result was that, when they were out of their time, they were compelled to come to London, or some other large town; they had no chance in their own town," therefore this employment of boy labour is no new thing. The complaint is made that the boy labour, this system of sweating introduced through boy labour, is a new thing, but it is no such thing; the boys have always been apprenticed and taught their trade, and the boys are now being taught in the same

same way as before. Now I will deal with Mr. Richards' evidence on page 443. Mr. Richards makes statements against us, and makes a great many statements here which are totally untrue. At the time that he was dealing with our firm, he was doing a large business with a great many of the West-end firms, and a great many firms in the country, but he makes out that he was depending entirely and solely upon us.

5921. Where does he say that?

At 4453: "From the time I had been working for Messrs. Maple I had gradually been losing my former connection, and in this way I became more dependent on that firm for work"; and so he goes on following that up. I have brought a statement of the accounts to show you. You see in Mr. Richards' case I have not the invoices to produce, because the question that he raises was so long since. Our business with Mr. Richards occurred between the years 1871 and 1879; and though I have got the copies of the bought ledgers, I have not got the invoices. The whole business transactions which we had with Mr. Richards amounted to 21,615 *l.* 6 *s.* 1 *d.* The total amount of overcharges that were taken off those invoices came to 193 *l.* 0 *s.* 4 *d.* He was paid for 209 *l.* 8 *s* net, because the goods were sold net; he allowed us 5 per cent. off 2,041 *l.* 0 *s.* 6 *d.*, and only 2½ per cent. off 19,171 *l.* 17 *s.* 3 *d.* That is a statement which can be sworn to, and books can be produced to verify those figures. That represents the transactions we had with Mr. Richards. Now he complains here of our treatment in respect of some furniture which he was asked to tender for with other firms.

5922. Is that the case you alluded to just now?

That is the case which is duplicated in Mr. Harry Ham's evidence. Mr. Richards was asked, as he says, with two other firms to submit samples.

5923. At what number is this evidence?

Number 4559 I think is the shortest way of stating it; but it is also in No. 4558. I will read from No. 4558: "(*Chairman*): You are making for them now?"——

5924. Is this referring to Maple & Co.?

Yes. "No; I have ceased this ten years or this eight years. I have had quite enough of it. I immediately asked at what price they were wanted, as I could not compete with the others in price, as the class of goods we produced were so different."

5925. This is the case mentioned by Mr. Ham, you say?

By Mr. Ham.

5926. How do you know that it is the same?

Because it is exactly the three people, and the hotel, and all the circumstances of the case. If you read the two concurrently you will see "Mr. Regnart told me they had no price given, and that they wanted the three qualities to see which their customers would select. I made six suites and sent them in, and also an invoice of my prices. I was requested to attend on a particular day at Messrs. Maple's, and I did so. They had the various suites set out in a room specially arranged for the purpose. My suites were selected by their customer, and I was so informed by Messrs. Maple's representative, and I naturally expected the order to proceed with the work. Not having received same, I went and saw Mr. Regnart to know the reason. He referred me to Lunnis, the salesman. Mr. Lunnis then handed me a written order for the goods; but all the prices were 15 to 20 per cent. less than my invoice prices. For instance, the price charged by me for the first item, a six-foot wardrobe, was 22 *l.* 15 *s.*; Messrs. Maple offered me 18 *l.*, they finding the plate glass, which would be about 30 *s.* in value. I went to Mr. Regnart to know the meaning of this, and he said it was all they could pay; it was all Mr. Blundell's doing" (that means myself), "to sell it at the price, and if I did not do it someone else must. Of course I could not do the suites at the prices offered, as, in fact, they would have cost me at least 2 *l.* more than the price Maple offered me. I reckoned it would have cost me 1 *l.* or 2 *l.*

 more

more than the price they offered me. Then the goods were offered to and afterwards made by one of the other competitors. The price I paid for making the sample wardrobe, and which I should have paid for making the whole, was 8 *l.* 6 *s.* The price actually paid by the other firm was 5 *l.* 15 *s.*, a difference of 2 *l.* 11 *s.* each; and, therefore, on this item alone, the workmen were sweated to the extent of more than 1,000 *l.* Now, it must be obvious that if Messrs. Maple had made these samples themselves they would have had to pay the full labour price for making, and that would have left the other honestly competing firms a much better chance of obtaining the order, and it would also have prevented them from sweating the labour price down to the extent which they actually did." Then the next question is: "I do not quite understand what you complain of in this last case which you have mentioned to the Committee. As I understand it, you and two other makers sent suites to Messrs. Maple?—(*A.*) Yes. (*Q.*) And that your suite was selected by the customer?—(*A.*) My pattern, the sample suite, that was the suite that was followed. (*Q.*) That was selected by the customer?—(*A.*) Yes. (*Q.*) But that you did not get the job because they would not give you your invoice price?—(*A.*) Yes. (*Q.*) And that one of your competitors made the furniture?—(*A.*) Made my pattern. (*Q.*) You mean to say that your pattern was taken, and, therefore, what you complain of is that you had the trouble of making the sample and did not get the work?—(*A.*) That is it. I complain also that the customer is not being well treated either. I state that the customer could not have been well treated." Now as regards this particular case referred to, it was the furnishing of the North Eastern Hotel at York, and Mr. Richards was asked, with some other equally good makers, to give us a price for some bedroom suites, not the enormous quantity he refers to of 300 or 400, because in the whole hotel I believe there are only 200 rooms; but he was asked to make some sample suites, which he did, and which the other competitors made too; they were sent in to us, and different patterns were chosen, some articles from one set and some from another. In furniture, as in other things, when large quantities are produced they can be produced cheaper, and a price was submitted which we thought, in the interests of our customers, should be paid; for I may tell you as regards this North Eastern Hotel at York, that the order was placed with us, and I had to take charge of the order myself to see that they had good value. The samples, when approved by their committee, were all stamped, and a price given to the committee at which they would be supplied; and the railway company were most particular (as railway companies always are), and they appointed a first-class cabinet maker to see that everything was supplied to its proper quality and proper standard, and the whole of the order was carried out, and I may say has turned out most satisfactory, for never has anything been done to the hotel since it was furnished by ourselves on its being opened. Mr. Richards complains that he did not have the order for this furniture placed with him because another manufacturer made the article cheaper. That is the whole question of his complaint. He made his samples of furniture which he sent in, and for which we paid, and we offered him to make certain of these patterns, with certain alterations in them, at a certain price, which he refused. Another manufacturer, making equally good things, made these things required, and those things made by that man were used as the samples, and were stamped by the Hotel Company. Therefore there has been no earthly wrong done to this man Richards. It was a fair and honest transaction. The other man who did not have the order might equally well have complained that he had been treated badly, and if I had given the order to Mr. Richards, both of those two other manufacturers might equally well have complained. Mr. Richards goes out of his way to say that "there is not a soul in the place that knows anything about the thing." In reply to Question 4557 he draws a graphic description of how my firm has ruined lots of other people, and he goes on further to say that "a gentleman comes and wants something done; there is not a soul in the place that knows anything about the thing." Those who have served properly their business know how to take an order and to carry out an order, and we have on our firm some of the very best designers, and we design largely ourselves; and whenever a customer wants anything specially made, a design

design is made for us. Sometimes a manufacturer will bring a design and submit to us a design or a new idea; but we have designers, and we are thoroughly qualified, as has been proved in all the very largest works, to undertake the very best furnishing. The Grand Hotel, the Hôtel Métropole, and all these hotels have been furnished by our firm; and therefore the insinuations of Mr. Richards as to our business qualifications, I think you will say, are most uncalled for. Now, I will go to Mr. Deintje. In his evidence at page 451, as you will see, he speaks of the firm, and says that he has always had satisfactory transactions with Messrs. Maple, and that his treatment has been all that was proper and straightforward; and then follows this in reply to Question 4648. The question is: "And yet they are constantly making bad articles, you say?" and his answer is, "I never said that; I said that on very few occasions I had had money deducted by Maple's, but that when money has been deducted, it has been on account of fault being found with the article." That is the case, that when we arrange to pay a price for anything, if the article is up to quality and to order, never is a deduction attempted to be made; but if an article is inferior, or requires our own work-people to improve it by doing certain work, cabinet-making or polishing, in respect of it, then we let the man take it back to his workshop to do it, or else we may deduct a few shillings for the expense of doing it. But after this witness had finished Mr. Arnold White then came forward and charged Mr. Regnart, and charged ourselves, with tampering with this last witness, as you will see in 4653: "You allege that the last witness has been tampered with by Messrs. Maple's manager?" and the answer is "That is my inference."

5927. Has not this entirely to do with Mr. Regnart?

No, not entirely, I think; because Mr. Regnart is here supposed to be my agent, and I think Mr. Regnart would not have attempted to do anything excepting as my agent in the matter.

5928. Would not Mr. Regnart be better able to speak on this point if he wishes to?

He would be able to be examined on the point. As regards myself and my firm, I am here to declare that I never think of tampering with any witness, nor has any witness that has been connected with giving evidence before this Committee been tampered with in any shape or form. I am here to defend the character of my firm, and the character of myself; and, though it may seem a light charge to certain people, I think it is the most groundless and unjust charge ever made against a respectable firm (*the Witness reads a letter*).

The Committee-room is cleared.

On the re-admission of the public.

5929. *Chairman.*] You were alluding to an alleged communication or conversation that took place between Mr. Deintje and Mr. Regnart, Messrs. Maple's manager, a conversation in which it was supposed, or might be supposed, that Mr. Deintje's evidence had been in some way tampered with, and you wished to disclaim, in fact you did disclaim, on the part of the firm any such action, and you wished to further go into the question. The Committee have considered that point, and they have come to the conclusion that what I read out to you in reference to Mr. Deintje (at Numbers 5005 to 5007) completely covers the whole case. As the Committee decided on the application that there was no evidence whatever that Mr. Deintje had been tampered with or influenced, or that there was any slur cast upon his character, of necessity the same holds good with regard to Mr. Regnart in so far as he was acting for the firm of Messrs. Maple and Co., and holds good as regards your firm also. Therefore the Committee see no object in going any further into the matter?

The object is this. As you are aware, I asked in the first instance to be allowed to cross-examine the witnesses, and also to be represented by counsel. I was not allowed either of those things, and I contended then, and I contend now, that the whole of this seems to me to have been a conspiracy against our firm.

5930. That appears to me to be another matter. I want to keep you to this point of Mr. Deintje?

I am keeping to the point of it. The assertion made there is that Mr. Deintje had given evidence that was altogether different from what he had stated; whereas Mr. Deintje says that the evidence they wanted him to give before the Committee was different altogether from the evidence that he told Mr. Arnold White's solicitor he was prepared to state.

5931. Do I understand you that you are not alluding to this occasion at all?

I am alluding to that occasion.

5932. I have already said that the Committee have completely exonerated Mr. Deintje in the matter, that nothing whatever has been brought before them affecting him, and, therefore, *a fortiori*, there can be no evidence against Mr. Regnart, or against Messrs. Maple & Co., in this particular case?

I only want to use this, not touching particularly upon that point, or confining myself to that, but I want it to aid me in doing what I propose to do, namely, to show the conspiracy that is at the bottom of this persecution of my firm.

5933. Do I understand you that you wish to give evidence before the Committee of the existence of a conspiracy?

Of a conspiracy.

5934. That is not the particular point which was before the Committee when we cleared the room?

One comes out of the other. As you see, at No. 5797, I make use of this language: "I say conspiracy, for I am able to prove and adduce letters written by Mr. Arnold White's solicitors, and Mr. Parnell, to different tradespeople, asking them to give evidence against my firm, and waiting upon different tradespeople, and trying to get them to state things which they were unable to do. I can also prove that important evidence has been withheld, which, considering the public utility that this inquiry is intended to serve, and considering the claims that Mr. Arnold White makes upon the credulity of the public as to being a philanthropist, as to having no personal spite, and only wanting to elicit the truth, shows most distinctly the conspiracy which exists;" and it is upon that, and for that purpose, that I want to deal by-and-bye with those remarks of Mr. Deintje's.

5935. A short time ago I think I asked you whether you had disposed of the facts stated in evidence, and I think you then told the Committee that you would go on with the facts, and I said on behalf of the Committee that if you wished to bring evidence about conspiracy, the Committee would then consider the case; have you disposed of the facts?

I have disposed of the facts, excepting that I shall have to revert to the facts to bear upon this statement of mine as regards conspiracy.

5936. That is the question you now wish to go into?

That is the question I now wish to go into.

5937. Are you alluding especially to the evidence of Mr. Arnold White? I think the other day you made a special mention of the manner in which Mr. Arnold White had brought forward the evidence that affected your firm?

I have not demonstrated the way in which it was brought forward. I dealt with his statements made, and I dealt with the witnesses he had brought forward to prove his statements; but I have not explained how, through his solicitors, he has been getting evidence together, spending, as he himself says, hundreds of pounds.

5938. Of course the Committee are quite aware that great pains have been taken, and that considerable sums of money have been expended by Mr. Arnold White on this inquiry. There is an advertisement which appeared in the papers in which Mr. Arnold White's solicitors advertise for witnesses to give information. The advertisement says: "Sir,—As solicitors for Mr. Arnold White, we shall feel obliged if you will permit us to state that he

he invites communications, through us, from persons engaged in the cabinet trade. Such communications will be regarded as confidential, unless otherwise permitted, and in the event of evidence being used involving loss to the person giving it, a guarantee will be given against any such loss." That is signed by Messrs. Terrell and Atkinson. The Committee also are aware, as I have just said, that Mr. White has expended considerable sums of money on this inquiry; Mr. White has mentioned the fact himself in evidence before the Committee. But nothing whatever has been brought before the Committee showing that there has been any attempt to obtain untrue evidence, or to deal corruptly with the witnesses before the Committee; therefore unless you intend to produce evidence in proof of such practices, the Committee see no reason for going into the question of the way in which the evidence has been brought forward?

I wish to bring out this fact, that in reply to that advertisement the solicitors had statements made to them, and that they told those witnesses that they wanted nothing but that which would be against our firm, and that when statements were made affecting others they were left out of those statements, and that only those that could say anything against my firm have been brought before your Lordships.

5939. You do not, as I understand, bring forward any evidence in proof of any corrupt tampering with the witnesses, or inducing witnesses to withhold evidence, or give untrue evidence?

Every day information is coming to me——

5940. Will you please answer my question; you do not bring forward any evidence of such tampering with witnesses?

At the present moment, no. I bring forward this fact: that the witnesses have not been allowed to bring before your Lordships the statements that they made to the solicitors.

5941. Do you mean that witnesses have been prevented from giving, or induced to withhold giving, evidence?

Yes, to withhold giving the evidence that they intended, and to give only that part of the evidence that would damage our firm. That is serious.

5942. As I understand, you are prepared to prove that witnesses have been prevented from giving evidence?

Yes, that their statements have been altered, cut down, remarks upon other firms being struck out——

5943. That appears to me to be quite a different thing. I ask whether you can give evidence to show that witnesses have been prevented from giving evidence?

Allow me to say in reply to that, that when you use the word "prevented," I should ask you to say in what way you mean prevention. When they have made a statement, and it has been taken down in shorthand, and the statement has been sent to them, the remarks on it which they made, leaving in only those remarks which would be damaging to ourselves, that is being "prevented," I think.

The Committee-room is cleared.

On the re-admission of the public.

5944. *Chairman.*] The Committee have decided not to go into the question of the manner in which evidence has been prepared, unless it involves charges of corruption or intimidation. As I understand you, you have finished dealing with the matters of fact; the facts which are brought against your house in evidence?

Yes, I have.

The Witness withdrew.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Veneris, 29° *Junii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of CANTERBURY.
Earl of DERBY.
Earl of ONSLOW.
Viscount GORDON (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord CLINTON.
Lord CLIFFORD OF CHUDLEIGH.
Lord FOXFORD (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord ROTHSCHILD.
Lord MONKSWELL.
Lord THRING.

LORD KENRY (EARL OF DUNRAVEN AND MOUNT-EARL), IN THE CHAIR.

MR. FREDERICK BAKER KIRBY, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

5945. *Chairman.*] ARE you a Bank Manager?
Yes.

5946. Of what bank?
The City Bank, Tottenham Court-road.

5947. The branch in Tottenham Court-road?
Yes, the branch.

5948. I will call your attention to a letter read before the Committee by Mr. Maple in answer to Question 5819; the letter is addressed to Messrs. Maple and Company, and is as follows: "Gentlemen,—In reply to your inquiry respecting our method of dealing with cheques drawn by your firm and received in payment by various customers, I beg to inform you that it has always been our practice to treat them as equivalent to cash." Were you the writer of that letter?
Yes.

5949. And that statement is correct?
Quite correct.

5950. Does that refer to open cheques or to crossed cheques?
Crossed cheques.

5951. How long have you been the manager of this City branch?
About 16 years I have been manager.

5952. I mean of this particular branch, how long?
16 years.

5953. And has it been your custom during the whole of that time to treat crossed cheques as cash?
Always to treat them as absolute cash. However weak our own customer might be, if he paid in a cheque of Messrs. Maple's, we always used to treat it as absolute cash and pay away against it.

 5954. That

5954. That would be in the case of a man having a banking account with you?
Yes.

5955. In the case of a man not having a banking account with you, you would not cash one of these crossed cheques for him?
Certainly not, unless he were introduced by a customer; and if the customer put on the back of the cheque, "Please exchange," we should then do it.

5956. Have you many of these crossed cheques presented for payment?
On Saturday a very large number are paid, as a rule, by different customers.

5957. And this system of paying crossed cheques over the counter is a special arrangement made between you and the firm of Messrs. Maple and Company?
I do not know about it being a special arrangement, but we treated the cheques, because of the standing of Messrs. Maple, as cash, more on their own account.

5958. Did you find this system in vogue when you became manager of this branch?
Yes, certainly.

5959. It did not originate with you?
No. I was sub-manager from about 1867, and then we were always in the habit of treating Messrs. Maple's cheques as cash.

5960. Then you could not answer the question I put to you before, as to whether it was the result of a special arrangement?
Not within my knowledge; there was no special arrangement within my knowledge.

5961. And you would treat these crossed cheques in every way the same as open cheques for your customers?
We treated them as bank notes.

5962. And you treat them so still?
Yes. However weak our customer might be, if he brought in a cheque and paid it into his account, which was drawn by Messrs. Maple and Company, and his own cheque was presented at the same time, or during the business hours of the day, we should treat as absolute cash the cheque that we had received and pay against it.

5963. I suppose if the customer's account was overdrawn to the amount of the cheque he would not be able to get any money on it?
If the customer were overdrawn we should, of course, set the cheque against the overdraft.

5964. Lord *Thring*.] Do you recollect Mr. Miller, a witness in this case?
I cannot say. I daresay if I saw him I might recollect him.

5965. Do you recollect the fact of his having presented cheques at your bank for cashing?
He would present them in the ordinary course.

5966. I ask you whether you recollect the fact of the witness having presented the cheques at your bank?
It would not come under my observation.

5967. You do not recollect it?
Because it was a regular thing.

5968. So many cases of it would occur, you mean?
So many cases; it was an understood thing.

5969. Do you recollect the years in which Mr. Miller was accustomed to present cheques to you?
He never presented them to me.

5970. At

5970. At your bank?
The cheque was paid in to his credit and he drew against it.

5971. Do you recollect the time when Mr. Miller did bring cheques to your bank and draw against them?
I recollect that he had an account with us for a certain number of years, and paid in and drew out.

5972. And what were those years?
He first opened the account on the 3rd of March 1881 under the name of Miller and Wicks. We knew nothing of Mr. Wicks; the account was entirely under the control of Miller. That account was closed on the 12th September 1881, and transferred to Miller and Company.

5973 And when did that close?
That closed on the 11th November 1884, by request.

5974. By request of Miller, do you mean?
By request of the bank.

5975. Miller's account was closed by whose request?
By our request.

5676. You requested him to close his account?
Yes.

5977. During the whole of that time that you mentioned you can state positively that if Mr. Miller presented any cheque of Messrs. Maple and Company's at your bank, and drew another cheque against it, that cheque was paid immediately in cash?
It would be paid, most decidedly.

5978. Without any deduction whatever?
No deduction whatever. It is just possible that one thing might occur; but of course my memory will not serve me: it is just possible that if a new cashier were at the desk, he might come to me and say, "Will you pay against Maple's cheque for Miller?" but an old cashier, knowing the system, would raise no question whatever.

5979. As a matter of fact, you can state positively that during the whole of that time, in the case of every cheque duly presented by Mr. Miller against which he drew a cheque, that cheque drawn against it was paid in cash without any deduction whatever?
Yes.

5980. You are certain of that?
Yes, I am positive.

5981. Earl of *Onslow*.] Did you ever refuse to cash Miller's cheques?
When there were no funds, certainly we did.

5982. You have refused to cash cheques drawn by Miller?
Repeatedly, when there were no funds.

5983. Just look at this cheque (*handing a cheque to the Witness*). That cheque is dated the 4th of November 1882, is it not?
Yes.

5984. That was during the time that Miller had an account open in his own name, between 1881 and 1884. Do you recollect what day of the week the 4th of November was?
I do not.

5985. If it were paid in on the Saturday would it bear the date-stamp of the Saturday or of the Monday following?
There is no date; we only stamp them; not with the date.

5986. What is that perforation (*pointing to a perforation in the cheque*)?
Either by Maple and Company or by the Union Bank.

5987. Is it not done by the Union Bank?
The Union Bank, the 6th of the 11th; that would be paid on the 6th November.

5988. That would be two days after the cheque was drawn?
Yes.

5989. Assuming that the 4th was a Saturday, would not that show that the cheque was drawn on the 4th and presented by you on the 6th?
Yes.

5990. Have you nothing on it to show on what day it was handed in to your bank?
Nothing whatever.

5991. At any rate you received that cheque in time to clear it on the Monday?
If paid in on the Saturday it would be sure to be presented on the following Monday.

5992. Earl of *Limerick.*] If it were paid in on the Monday, when would it be presented?
It would depend on the time; if before three o'clock, it would be presented at the Union Bank in Regent-street, on the Tuesday.

5993. It would not be presented in Regent-street on the same day as it was presented in Tottenham Court-road?
No; we never made a special presentation of Maple's cheques.

5994. Earl of *Onslow.*] What time does your bank close on Saturday?
Two o'clock now.

5995. What time did it close in 1882?
Three o'clock.

5996. And can you, speaking from your own knowledge, say at what hour Messrs. Maple and Company closed their premises?
No, I cannot.

5997. But you never closed before three o'clock in 1882?
Not before three.

5998. Would any cheque of Messrs. Maple, paid in to your bank between two and three on a Saturday afternoon, have been treated by you as cash?
Certainly.

5999. Did Messrs. Maple use any special stamp upon cheques that were paid in to your bank?
No, not to my knowledge.

6000. And there was no stamp upon it, "Please pay at counter," or "Payable at counter"?
No.

6001. You have never had any complaint from Miller of not crediting him with the amount at once, and allowing him to draw against Messrs. Maple's cheques?
No, we have had no complaint from him, not the slightest; the complaint was on the other side.

6002. Earl of *Derby.*] Will you explain that answer, please; "the complaint was on the other side"?
Because he was so exceedingly troublesome to us.

6003. Lord *Sandhurst.*] What does "troublesome" mean?
Troublesome to a banker means, drawing upon him when there are no funds; he would have to look every time.

6004. Lord *Rothschild.*] Did I understand you to say that you often cash crossed cheques at your counter?

No

No; we treat these crossed cheques that are paid into a customer's account as cash; only those paid into a customer's account.

6005. But you do not cash crossed cheques across the counter for those that are not customers?
No, certainly not.

6006. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] Under what circumstances would you cash cheques which would have written on them "please exchange for Messrs. Maple"?
We have an account called an exchange account, and we hand the money over to the person who wants the exchange, and the exchange account is debited with the item; it does not go to the debit of the customer asking for the exchange.

6007. Does that apply only to the case of customers?
We never make an exchange excepting for a customer, or anyone who is personally known to ourselves.

6008. What is the object of Messrs. Maple writing on the cheque "please exchange" if that is your practice?
But they would not do that.

6009. I thought you said the cheque would be presented with the words "please exchange"?
A man would take a cheque of Maple & Co., and if he had no banking account he would go to a friend of his who had one with us; this friend of his would write on the back "please exchange," and that makes the man responsible.

6010. You were not referring to Messrs. Maple writing "please exchange"?
No.

6011. Lord *Monkswell.*] You say that you would put the crossed cheque brought by Miller against his overdraft if he had overdrawn; that is to say if he pays a cheque over the counter you do not give him the money for it unless he has funds?
He pays the crossed cheque into his account.

6012. And draws against it?
Yes.

6013. Suppose he has overdrawn his account, he could not get the money; it is not like a bank note in that case?
It would be like a bank note to the extent that it was over and above what the overdraft was.

6014. If Messrs. Maple give him money, he puts the money in his pocket, and it is there; but if he brings the cheque to you and has overdrawn his account he would not get the money for it?
Yes; but his account never was overdrawn?

6015. I thought you said it constantly was?
No; we never permitted him to overdraw. I said he was troublesome because he drew upon us when he had no funds; but we never gave him the opportunity of seeing what the City Bank money was like.

6016. *Chairman.*] Is it a common thing for bankers to cash crossed cheques in this way?
I do not think it is a question of cashing crossed cheques, because it is paid in to a man's account, and the question then remains with the banker whether he should treat it as a good solid document or whether he should not pay against it until it is actually cash in the hands of the receiving banker.

6017. Is it customary with you to treat crossed cheques as you treat those of Messrs. Maple?
Whenever we have a solid customer it is usual to pay against uncleared cheques; but where the customer is a weak one, it is reserved for the judgment of the management whether a cheque should be paid against or not.

 6018. Are

6018. Are you aware whether this arrangement whereby crossed cheques are so treated by you was made for the convenience of manufacturers manufacturing for Messrs. Maple & Co.?
Oh, no.

6019. It was not made for their special convenience?
Certainly not.

6020. It would be no convenience to them if they did not keep a banking account with you?
No; it is the usual practice, I think, with bankers with a fair customer to give him the opportunity.

6021. If these manufacturers receiving payments in crossed cheques from Messrs. Maple wished to avail themselves of this method of cashing them that you adopt, they would have to open an account with your bank?
Not necessarily. I think any bank would cash Messrs. Maple's cheques if they were presented for payment in the same way as we do by a contra account, debit and credit.

6022. You do not think it is peculiar to you?
No, certainly not. We did not think of our customers in the matter; we thought of Messrs. Maple.

6023. And in the case of a customer's account being over-drawn, or in the case of his not having any credit to his account, you would naturally, as you say, credit the value of the cheques first to his account before allowing him to draw upon it?
If he were a fairly respectable man, and if he were very anxious to have the whole of the cheque, we should let him have it without any reference to the overdraw.

6024. Lord *Thring*.] You are quite positive that Mr. Miller was never allowed to overdraw his account during that period?
Never to my knowledge.

6025. Therefore, you are equally positive that whenever Mr. Miller paid in his cheques, they were virtually paid in cash?
Treated as cash.

6026. Earl of *Onslow*.] I should like to read you a question and answer in Mr. Miller's evidence at No. 2451 with reference to paying between 1 and 2 o'clock on Saturday: "Is that with the idea that you could get to a bank by 2 o'clock? (*A*.) It would be no good; the cheques are printed crossed, and the bank would not pay you the cash." Such a statement with regard to your bank would be untrue?
It could not be made with regard to us; it must have been made with regard to the Union, who would not pay a crossed cheque.

6027. But with regard to your bank, such a statement would be untrue?
Yes.

6028. Earl of *Derby*.] How far is your bank from Messrs. Maple's premises?
About two minutes' walk.

6029. Lord *Clinton*.] Then these cheques of Mr. Miller's might have been taken to the Union Bank, the head office, might they?
Unless taken by somebody who had an account at the bank, a crossed cheque would not be paid; it must be an open cheque. The Union Bank would not pay their own customers' cheques in that way.

6030. Mr. Miller might have been referring to the Union Bank in the answer he gave?
It is just possible.

6031. The Union Bank has an office in Regent-street?
Yes.

6032. Earl

6032. Earl of *Onslow.*] Whether it was a Union Bank cheque or a cheque on any bank in London, signed by Messrs. Maple & Co., you would credit it at once to your customer's account, and allow him to draw upon it?
Yes, open or crossed.

6033. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] Would the statement that a crossed cheque would not be cashed be true, presumably, of any bank, except yours, under the circumstances?
I think all banks would do the same as we; they would cash the cheques in the way that we do, paying it to the man's credit and letting him draw against it.

6034. I am speaking of a man with no account at the bank?
Then he would have to get a customer to put his name against the account.

6035. Lord *Rothschild.*] It is the fact that Mr. Miller could not get a crossed cheque cashed at the Union Bank?
Not a crossed cheque.

6036. Therefore he was bound to pay it in to his own bank?
Yes.

6037. Therefore, if presented at that bank, and he had overdrawn his account, the amount of the overdraw would be deducted from it?
Yes.

6038. Lord *Monkswell.*] Can you bring your books to show whether Miller was ever allowed to overdraw or not; can you find that out?
We have a daily record which proves whenever an account is on the wrong side; I will look it up. It has never been overdrawn in Miller's case within my knowledge; if it ever was overdrawn, it was quite by accident.

6039. Lord *Sandhurst.*] You say that you do not cash crossed cheques for a man who has not got an account with you; therefore for people to have their crossed cheques cashed, they must necessary deal with your bank?
Not if they get a customer of our own to ask us to exchange the cheque.

6040. Therefore, unless he got some friendly customer to do that for him, the crossed cheque is not as good as cash to the workman; he must go to the public-house or somewhere else to get it cashed?
If the man has not either friends who are customers at the bank, or a banking account of his own, he would have a document, a little bit troublesome to him. With such a cheque as Maple's, such a difficulty as that would never arise; any one of our publicans in the neighbourhood would put their name on the back.

6041. *Chairman.*] I would like to call your attention to something that Mr. Maple said in evidence the other day, in answer to Question 5833. In his answer, Mr. Maple, speaking of these cheques, says, "But the usual way with a cross cheque is that it has to go to the Clearing House, as your Lordship will know, to be cleared, and after the bank gets the money for it, then it is passed to the credit of the customer." Then Mr. Maple is asked, "But you had a special arrangement, I understand you, with the bank that that should not be done?" And his answer is: "I had a special arrangement with the bank that they should treat our cheques like a bank note." Then Mr. Maple is asked, "In order to meet a possible difficulty?" And he replies: "In order to meet a possible difficulty." I understand you to say that there was no special arrangement made, and that a cheque of Mr. Maple's would be treated in a similar way at any bank?
Of course, I can only speak for my own bank. There was no special arrangement with us.

6042. That might have been made before you became manager of the bank?
Yes, it might have been made.

6043. Lord *Thring.*] You do not believe it was?
I do not say about that; I cannot speak for another man.

6044. *Chairman.*] But you think there was no necessity for making any special arrangement with Messrs. Maple?

They are thought so much of in Tottenham Court-road that we never raise a question.

6045. Earl of *Onslow.*] Were you the manager of the City Bank when they first opened a branch in Tottenham Court-road?

I was sub-manager about 12 months after it was opened.

6046. Then any arrangement made at the time that the branch was opened might have been made without your knowledge?

It would have come under my knowledge as sub-manager after the time I was appointed there, but not any previous arrangement.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. JOHN BLUNDELL MAPLE (a Member of the House of Commons), is further Examined, as follows:

6047. *Chairman.*] I understood you to say at the close of your evidence the other day, that you had finished dealing with the matters of fact?

Yes.

6048. But I understood you to say before, that you were anxious to go into some other matters which the Committee decided not then to investigate; and I am afraid there may possibly be some misunderstanding in your mind on this point, and I therefore wish to tell you that the Committee will, if they find it desirable, satisfy themselves at the proper stage as to the manner in which the evidence brought before them has been collected. I understand, now that you have finished with the matters of fact, and I shall propose to ask you some questions?

I shall be very pleased to answer them.

6049. Before asking you any questions on specific points that have been raised, I would like to ask you a few questions as to the general subject before the Committee; the alleged sweating in the cabinet-making and upholstery trades; we have had many various definitions of sweating before the Committee; for instance, one of the witnesses before us, Mr. Parnell, considers sweating to be "the taking out of any undue profit from work that would otherwise go, or that could otherwise be applied, to the labour put into that work;" that, I presume, means that he considers that the proper proportion is not observed between the remuneration of labour and the profit of the capitalist; I do not want to go at length into that subject, which is rather an abstruse one, but I should like to know what your opinions are upon that point. You have had, I think you said, 27 years' experience in the business?

Just so.

6050. The cabinet-making and upholstery trades have been roughly divided before the Committee into what I may call three grades, that is to say, what has been called by Mr. Arnold White the First Class work, that done by good firms on their own premises, by their own workmen; the Second Class work, that given out by the great firms, done by piece-masters, many of whom are in the neighbourhood of Tottenham Court-road and the Third Class work, work of a cheap kind made for working men's homes, and which we have been told is carried on principally in Curtain-road and in Bethnal Green; would you consider that the upholstery and cabinet-making trades can be fairly divided into those three classes of work?

There are quite as many as three different classes; in fact, cabinet furniture and upholstery can be produced from very high prices down to excessively low; and to draw a divisional line and say that there are only three sets, I think is within the mark considerably.

6051. But

6051. But, of course, it is rather a rough division?

It is a peculiar division; you might as well say that there were 10. Furniture can be, as I said before, produced at all sorts of prices; it depends upon the quality of the wood that is used; it depends upon the way in which the interior of the work is done; it depends altogether upon the workmanship before you get the article produced; it depends upon the quantity of mouldings that are put into the work or that are left out; and so on.

6052. Are you acquainted with the work that is carried on in Curtain-road and Bethnal Green?

No, I cannot say that I am myself, because it is many years since I have been down there.

6053. You could not answer any question connected with that locality?

Not with that locality.

6054. Then, as to what has been called the first-class work, that work which is done by good firms on their own premises and by their own workmen; you can speak of that part of the work?

I am aware of the first-class work that is done by firms who are retailers at the same time that they are manufacturers; but there is equally good work produced by firms who are not retailers, who produce for the retailers.

6055. Your own business would come under that category?

In my own business we manufacture and we buy, and also we have factories that work exclusively for us.

6056. I would call your attention to what Mr. Deintje said at Question 4615; he says, speaking of your firm at the end of that answer, "Maple's did not copy because then they did not make cabinet work; they have only made chair frames and upholstery; they have never clashed with me in the high class cabinet or dining-rooms." I do not know what that means?

Mr. Deintje does not produce dining-room furniture; his has been cabinets which were of a superior nature and sold by most of the best West End firms, as also by ourselves.

6057. I understand him to mean that you, Maple and Company, did not clash with him in the high class work; does that mean that Maple and Company do not manufacture the high class work?

No, I do not think he means that; simply not his particular work.

6058. Would you say in your experience that of late years any change has taken place in the relative proportions of wages and the other factories in the cost of production?

My own opinion is that with the introduction of machinery, articles are produced a great deal cheaper than they used to be, because now all the planing, the sawing, the turning, and the mortising, and so on, is done by machinery, removing thereby a great deal of work that used to be done by what were then called sweaters, under the cabinet makers in the cabinet trade; and a wardrobe will equally pay a workman, a cabinet maker, to put together after these things have been prepared for him, for which he would receive now 6 *l.* 10 *s.*, as it would have done for him to do the whole work and get 10 *l.* before. That is to say that it is my belief, and our pay-sheets prove it, that the working men in the cabinet and upholstery trades are able to earn as much per week now throughout the year as they ever were.

6059. You consider that the proportion that wages bear, to the cost of production, is the same now as it formerly was?

Quite the same in proportion to the cost of the article. Everything is so much cheaper than it was in 1874.

6060. The proportion, however, is the same, you say?

The proportion is the same.

6061. Would you consider also that the relative proportion of profit to the cost of production is the same now as formerly?

Our profit, and the profit of all large retail houses, is considerably less per cent. than it was some few years since.

6062. But in proportion to the total cost of the production, do you mean?
That is so, in proportion to the cost of production. By competition in trade, and by reason of the co-operative stores, the net profit obtained by all houses is considerably less than it used to be; in fact in a large firm like ours, the net profit, it would perhaps surprise you to know, does not come to more than 9 per cent. on the returns of the business, and out of that you would have to pay interest on the capital with which you work.

6063. You say then that in your opinion the profit is diminished in proportion to the total cost of production, but that wages remain the same in proportion to the other items in the cost of production?
It is so.

6064. Now, as to the rate of wages, I think we have had evidence that the rate of wages has diminished. This is the evidence of Mr. Baum at No. 3159—He is asked: "If I understand you, you said that the workmen were paid much less, and that the customers paid as nearly as possible the same prices as formerly, and you argued that the profits went into the pockets of the masters to a much greater extent?" and he says: "Yes." Do you agree with that witness that workmen are paid much less than formerly?
I agree with the witness that workmen are paid less for piece-work than they were; but I say that their power of earning wages is equal to, if not greater than, what it ever was before. On all our pay-sheets, in every department, our workpeople during the 27 years that I have been in business have never received a decreased wage, and during that time have received increases; and to-day the men are earning more money, or as much money, per week as they ever earned before. As I explained to the Committee, we do not pay as much for, say, the upholstering of a couch by the piece as some of the West End houses would pay for that same work; but with us the men have permanent employment, and are able to earn as much per week, take the year through, in the constant employment that they get with our firm as they can by working at these old West End houses, the men with them being, as your witnesses have told you, very often without work for days, standing about waiting for a job. In large firms like ours we do not wait for an order; we manufacture for stock: and consequently workpeople are kept by us permanently at work manufacturing for stock, and even in the slack time you might see in our factories hundreds of easy chairs and couches, and so on, which have gone through certain stages; they are stuffed, waiting to be finished, and waiting for room in the show-rooms, when they will be finished and covered. That is a great assistance, I contend, to the working classses, because it enables you to permanently give to your employés work steadily throughout the year. If we did not do so, in our busy times we should require perhaps half as many people again at work. Say, for instance, that in the busy time we could do with 300 men, in the slack time there would only be work for 150, so that the others would be going about with nothing to do; but by working constantly 200 men, and taking their products in the slack times when they are not being sold from the show-rooms, we give to those men permanent work, and they are able to earn, as I say, as much money per week, averaged throughout the year, as men can with the firms who pay a higher price for piece-work, but do not give them such constant employment.

6065. I see you told us the other day at No. 5865, near the bottom of page 586: "It does occur, no doubt, in the old West End houses that a man perhaps may get by piece-work, as the witnesses who come will tell you, as much perhaps as 2 *l.* for stuffing a couch, for stuffing which same couch he will not get more from us than 30 *s.*; but then they get continued employment at that 30 *s.* from us, whereas in the other case they are standing about and waiting for a job at 2 *l.*"?
That is it.

6066. That is to say, you admit that in some cases they do not earn as much for

for the job in your firm as in some other firms; but you maintain that that is more than made up to them by the fact that they are continuously employed by your firm?

Yes. The evidence of this man Brown, who gave evidence against us, is very much on the same lines; and Mr. Howard informs me that Brown's wages last year averaged 50 *s.* per week, though some weeks he would be earning 3 *l.* 10 *s.* or more; other weeks he would be earning only 30 *s.*; in fact, he kindly showed my friend the pay sheets.

6067. I suppose you do not mean the Committee to infer that what you have called the old West End houses do not give constant employment?

You see by the other witnesses' evidence that they do not give, and that they cannot give, constant employment. They do not give constant employment, and cannot, because they do not manufacture for stock.

6068. Do you agree with the evidence that has been given before the Committee, that men, though they can earn the same amount of wage as formerly, have to give more labour in exchange for it; to work harder, in short?

They work with greater expedition, but they work considerably less hours than they did.

6069. Do they work less hours on account of their closing earlier on Saturdays?

On account of their closing earlier on Saturdays. Our workshops, as I told this Committee, commence at 8 o'clock in the morning and close every night at 7 o'clock, and at 2 o'clock on Saturdays. They only work 53½ hours in the week. When I first commenced business I have worked myself till 10 o'clock every night for the first four or five years that I was in business, and 12 o'clock at night on Saturdays.

6070. Would you agree generally, or disagree, with the proposition that a larger amount of work has to be given in exchange now for the same amount of wages as compared with 10 or 15 years ago?

Yes, there is more produced decidedly for the price.

6071. That more work is required. I am not speaking of machinery, and so on; I mean whether absolutely more work is required?

More work is done; but then against that, there are greater conveniences, and greater assistance is given for the production of that work, the result being that the workman earns as much per week as ever he did, and works less hours.

6072. I take it as your opinion then, that the workman earns as much per week as he did formerly, and does not work so many hours, but works harder?

He is more expeditious and better taught; and as regards the upholstery trade, to which we are particularly referring now, a man by being brought up as a stuffer learns to do his work much better, much more expeditiously, than if he only had a smattering, so to speak, of stuffing, a smattering of mattress-making, loose case cutting, and covering, and so on. Years ago the old upholsterers were, so to speak, Jacks-of-all-trades, not masters of any. The upholstery is better done now than it ever was; the mattress-making is better done.

6073. You are wandering a little from my point. What I want to get from you is your opinion on the point as to whether more work is given in exchange for the same amount of wages; or (if you like to put it in the other way), whether for the same work that a man gave 10 years ago he would now obtain less wages than he obtained 10 years ago?

Yes, through being, as I say, better able to do it, having greater aptitude and greater experience.

6074. That is to say, that the man's labour, owing to better appliances, enables more work to be done than formerly?

And better tuition enables more work to be done.

6075. That is not my question. You do say then, I presume, that more

 absolute

absolute work of muscle and brain is expended now to obtain the same wage than was expended 10 years ago?

Yes; but I say the brain is better educated and better able to do it.

6076. Is not that tantamount to saying that the rate of wages has been reduced?

If your Lordship would like to infer this; that, if the man had his present capabilities and knowledge and was working at the prices paid years ago, he would be earning more money than he is now, I say that that is the case. I think that meets your question.

6077. That is, as I say, tantamount to a reduction more or less in the wages?

Yes, that is so, in that way.

6078. If the processes that brought that about continue, is it not likely, in your opinion, to lead to a real reduction of wages. If more work is extracted for the same amount of wages now, and the processes that have brought that about continue, would they not result in the reduction of wages?

I do not see that they will at present; but the question of demand and supply and foreign competition must govern prices eventually. And as we are aware, and as your Lordships' Committee must be aware, the whole standard of the value of the coin has altered considerably; you can now purchase as much for 6 *d.* as in 1874 you purchased for 8 *d.*; therefore, in proportion to the commodities of life, a workman with the same wages earning what he used to do is better off and gets more pay. It is the same as the conversion of consols, it has the same application.

6079. I think you said the other day that one class were suffering, and that is those who have no work?

Yes, those who have no work.

6080. In your experience, do you suppose that the proportion of unemployed to employed is greater or less now than formerly?

I think that the proportion of the unemployed is increasing daily.

6081. Then if that be so, taking the whole trade, the wages fund distributed among them is probably less than it was formerly?

No doubt that applies equally to all trades; I was speaking generally.

6082. I am speaking of the cabinet making and upholstery trades?

I am afraid that I have no authoritative statement sufficient to justify me in saying anything as to the quantity of workpeople in our particular trades who are unemployed at the present time; I am only speaking generally.

6083. It was in allusion to your own trade that you said that there was a grievance or hardship on the part of the unemployed?

What I said was this: that those workpeople who have constant work and get the wages now have nothing to complain of, but those who are out of employment must be great sufferers. I think if you read my evidence you will see that that is what I said.

6084. What you said on the subject is in answer to Question 5862; speaking about your own trade, you say: "Your Lordships will understand that in trades like ours, in the cabinet trade, and the polishing trade, and the stuffing trade, and so on, they have continual work you may say from one year's end to the other"; and then you go on to say: "In fact, the only class that to me seem to be suffering are those that are not at work"?

That is so.

6085. I ask you whether in your opinion the proportion of those not at work is larger now than it used to be?

I think not in the cabinet and upholstery trades; I do not think there is any worse state of things in them than there was.

6086. You think there are not more men unemployed now?

In proportion to those that are employed, do you mean.

6087. In

6087. In proportion to the output of the whole trade than there were some years ago?
I should say not; I should say that the cabinet and upholstery trades are in an exceptionally good state compared with all other trades in the country.

6088. As regards unemployed?
As regards unemployed.

6089. You cannot give the Committee any information as to the number that are unemployed?
I cannot.

6090. I suppose the cost of material has considerably diminished of late years?
It has.

6091. And has the cost of the finished article?
Enormously.

6092. We have had evidence the other way, that the price of the finished article has not diminished?
You have had that in evidence from those who are unaware of the fact.

6093. In all branches of the trade has it diminished?
In all branches of the trade.

6094. In what you call the old West-end houses also?
Everywhere. Carpets that were 5 *s.* 3 *d.* a yard you can get for 3 *s.* 6 *d.* You may take every description of curtain material, you may take it to be fully in the same proportion, and in a good many cases very much more. Then you may deal in the same way with all descriptions of cabinet goods. And that has been produced equally by the greater productive power of machinery as introduced into everything; that has assisted most enormously to the decrease in the price, the standard of everything.

6095. Would you say, taking the trade generally, that the profits to the large firms, the capitalists, have diminished?
Most decidedly. We have, as your Lordship is aware, a great deal of competition amongst all the large houses, and we have also the co-operative stores, who publish their balance-sheets; and you can see that they buy and sell against us, and we are compelled to buy and sell against them. We must not sell dearer than they, or our business would go.

6096. I understand you that your business is very largely and very rapidly extending?
It is.

6097. But at the same time that is in spite of diminishing profits?
In spite of diminishing profits. It is the fact not only that, in order to maintain our position, we have to sell so cheap that we attract the increased trade of the country, or a great share of the increased trade of the country, but I regret to say that these old-fashioned houses, who do not move along the same lines, and produce in the same way, and get the things produced in the same way as we do, have to sell still dear, and consequently lose their custom and their trade; and that trade goes into these large houses.

6098. Then I may take it from you, that in your opinion the proportion of profits to the total cost of production is less than formerly?
It is. I think the revenue officers would tell you that, that on the returns of businesses, all the old businesses are paying considerably less income tax in amount.

6099. And also I may take it from you that, in your opinion, the relative proportion of wages to the cost of production remains about the same?
Remains about the same, both having decreased.

6100. But that more labour is given in exchange for the same amount of wage than formerly?
Quite so; that applies equally to all of us.

 6101. That

6101. That the cost of material has considerably diminished, and that the cost of the finished article has considerably diminished?
Enormously.

6102. Such is the general condition of the trade?
Of commerce, and of our trades; and I may say that considering that we go into a house which is just left by the builders, and furnish it throughout, that embraces nearly all trades.

6103. Could you give the Committee any idea what proportion the profit made by a large firm, say by your own firm, would bear to the wage obtained by the workman?
How would you mean, my Lord?

6104. I mean what proportion the profit is to wages; the proportion they would relatively bear?
That is a very abstruse calculation. In the first place, as I explained to your Lordships just now, the profit that comes to us would be about nine per cent. on the returns. Now the returns may be taken to embrace, I should say, right from the raw material one-half labour, and one-half raw material; but then there are so many different stages in the production of the article that are not within the cabinet maker's province; for instance, the timber is grown abroad; it has to be sawn there, it has to be shipped over here, it has to be seasoned in timber yards and dried, and then it has to be commenced to be worked upon; there are so many different stages.

6105. You do not think, in fact, that my question could be answered?
I do not think it is possible to give you any solution to it; it is a conundrum.

6106. Do you think that the remuneration of labour ought to vary in proportion as the interest on capital varies?
I think it is impossible by any legislation to interfere with that.

6107. I do not mean by legislation, but I ask you whether it ought to vary or not; do you think it does.
I think it does. I think the natural healthy condition of the trade is that labour participates in the general success.

6108. That if profits were large wages were high, and if profits were small wages would be low?
Wages would go down.

6109. Then how do you account for the fact that wages have not gone down much, while the profits have been diminishing.
But, as I explained, though earning the same wages they are producing more things; and indeed you proved that proposition yourself.

6110. Do you think that there is more competition among working men to get work than there was formerly?
I think that if you would allow me, I would explain that in all classes there must be more competition.

6111. You said that there is more competition among the capitalists?
Yes, and amongst the working classes. You see, in the provinces, for instance, where you have all the agriculturists having to leave the land, the agriculturists leaving in large quantities, the farmers also are in a very bad state, and consequently the cabinet makers and upholsterers in the country have less work in supplying the wants of those farmers and of the working classes that were working with the farmers. They therefore are attracted, no doubt, to these large centres; but the prices paid in London for cabinet work and for upholstery are, as your witnesses have told you, very much higher than are paid in the country at the present time. I do not believe that the workman in the country can produce so much work for his week's wage as the man does here in London. But the man at Lancaster, the cabinet maker, earns from 30 *s.* to 35 *s.* a week; a cabinet maker here in London would be wanting to earn 10 *s.* a week more, and would get it.

6112. I may

6112. I may take it from you that you think that that competition is more severe than it was formerly?

Decidedly, the demand not being so great, from the depression that is existing throughout the country, and also from the influence of foreign competition.

6113. Do you think that competition is caused partly by the demand not being so great throughout the country?

I do.

6114. And do you think it is caused also by foreign competition?

Decidedly.

6115. Do you think it is caused at all by too many men going into the trade, I mean more new hands going into the trade than the natural expansion of the trade would support?

There is no doubt that it is only natural that the working class shall be attracted to those trades where the best wages can be paid and earned, and in the cabinet trade, as in the upholstery trade and carpet planning, the wages earned are so much more than the wages earned in nearly any other description of trade, that it is likely to be, more than it has been in the past, a greater attraction for the working classes.

6116. Do you think that the improved machinery has had anything to do with it?

No doubt, enormously; because it displaces labour.

6117. You told us that you use gas engines for the sewing machines?

Yes.

6118. Would that enable the woman using the sewing machine to turn out more work, or would it merely relieve her of labour?

At the same time that it relieves her of work enormously, it enables her to turn out more. By this mechanism the woman has to put her foot on to the treadle, and if she puts it softly it goes very slow, if she puts it firmer it goes faster, and when she puts it down hard the machine would go nearly half as fast again as she could possibly tread it.

6119. And that would enable her to turn out more work in a day than before?

Yes, repaying us thereby the expense of the machinery and the driving power.

6120. You also use machinery now for cutting out wood?

Yes, planing and sawing.

6121. Would that enable a man, or a given number of men, to turn out more work now than formerly?

It would, a great deal more.

6122. Do you think that the perfection of machinery has the effect of displacing labour, or, by cheapening production, has the effect of ultimately increasing the demand for labour?

Both your propositions are correct. It cheapens most enormously; for instance, mouldings are run through machines all done, lovely work, which would have taken an enormous amount of time to do; consequently it cheapens work; and, naturally, the cheaper the article, the greater the demand of the public to have these things.

6123. But you have not answered my question; what in your opinion the effect is upon labour, whether it displaces it, or whether it increases the demand for it?

I say both. It increases the demand for the article and consequently for more labour; but insomuch as a greater amount of articles is produced by the labour, the one nearly balances the other.

6124. You think then, practically, the introduction or perfection of machinery has no appreciable effect upon labour?

It has where there is no increased demand.

6125. But at the same time you say it does increase the demand?

In certain descriptions of work it increases it; because people have their houses much better furnished than they ever had before. Your Lordship remembers the time that the farmer's house used to have the sanded floor and old Windsor chairs; and now they have carpeted floors, and stuffed and upholstered chairs, and so on, and every house is very much better furnished now than it ever was before; but if the prices were the old prices, and the work was done in the old-fashioned way, there would be room for double the quantity of mechanics that are at present employed.

6126. Do you suppose that the introduction or increase of boy-labour has had any large effect upon the adult labour employed?

I dispute the fact that there is more boy-labour employed now to what was employed years ago, in proportion.

6127. In proportion to what?

In proportion to the numbers employed. If you turn to the evidence of Mr. Ham, who is Secretary of the Cabinet Makers' Society, you will see that, in reply to Question 3858 he says this: The question is: "You would allow the employer to have a certain number of apprentices, but not the journeymen? and he says "Yes; in the shop where I was apprenticed in the country there were only two journeymen and always five or six apprentices going." Now Mr. Ham is, I should think from having seen him before your Committee, a man of 55 years of age, and he there says that when he was apprenticed in the country there were five or six apprentices going for only two journeymen. You could not have men in any trade without they commenced as boys; you could not make a good cabinet maker out of a young fellow starting with cabinet making at the age of 20 or 21; you must start him when he leaves school, or else you will never make him proficient.

6128. I will call your attention to what Mr. Baum said about this. There is some evidence of his on the subject at No. 3071, at page 300. He was speaking of your firm, and after speaking of the excellence of the leather work he goes on to say: "and yet, strange to say, that those workmen are the worst treated of the whole of them with regard to the prices they pay, and a comparison between the men's time during the last winter and the time they were paid for would show a remarkable discrepancy, and which, I explain to your Lordships in that particular way." He then goes on to explain; "They have a large number of apprentices there who are bound for five years. The lads are a good class of lad, fairly well educated, and generally the sons of small tradesmen, and who are bound for five years, and receive a good wage, rising from 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a week in the first year to a pound in the last?

It should be 3 *s.* in the first year; that is the right sum; directly they leave school they get that.

6129. "During that period they are kept working in sections, learning a part of the trade; they do not become the all-round professional upholsterer whom I described in the early part of my evidence; they are simply turned out as stuffers, in the result, in the end of their apprenticeship; and my experience as secretary of the trade society shows that for three or four years these men have to go about from shop to shop picking up a little here and a little there, practically finishing the learning of their trade." What I understand that Mr. Baum objects to in that is this, that by this system of employing boys or apprentices they are not being taught the whole of the trade, and that when they are out of their time, their five years, they find it difficult to obtain work, because they must obtain the work in the particular branch of the trade in which they have been educated; and he complains of that as making the men dependent on that particular branch of the trade. He thinks it better that they should have been brought up to the knowledge of the various divisions of the trade and that they would be able to obtain work easier if that were done. Is that your opinion?

No; most decidedly not. I think, and I am convinced, that there is quite enough to learn in the trade to be a good stuffer without attempting to learn the other branches that used to be carried on by the old upholsterer, the old upholsterer

upholsterer not being proficient in any one branch to the same extent that we require proficiency at the present time.

6130. You think, in fact, that what has been called the sub-division of labour is an advantage to the working man?
I do.

6131. Whereas Mr. Baum and others think it a disadvantage to him?
Mr. Baum is quite right that a stuffer, a young fellow taught the stuffing department in our house could not go to one of these old jobbing shops, as they are called, that send a man into a house to take up carpets, to take down blinds, and hang curtains, and cut loose covers, and do everything, because he would not have been prepared in that way; but he will earn as much money, in fact, more money than a man who could do that sort of thing, that jobbing work.

6132. And you think that a man leaving your premises and going out into the world has a better chance of making a good living if he is educated up to be a stuffer, than if he has been educated to be what you call an old-fashioned upholsterer?
I am perfectly certain he has. Our young fellows have no difficulty in obtaining positions, not only in this country, but also abroad; they can always go and get work. And as regards the quantity of these apprentices, you will have from Mr. Imlay the number that have left our firm since their apprenticeship, and I think I am right in saying that you will find that there are only 13 who have ever left our place to go into another place; that all of our apprentices, since we commenced apprenticing them, have been employed, and are employed in the firm, except only 13 of them who have sought situations elsewhere.

6133. Would not that tend to show that they would have a difficulty in getting situations elsewhere?
But they have got situations elsewhere.

6134. Only 13 of them?
But that is all that have left us.

6135. Might not that imply that they did not leave because, not knowing other branches of the trade, they would not be able to get work elsewhere?
No; because they are getting good wages at our premises, and they could go and get work elsewhere, and you will have some of them before you, I think, to answer those questions.

6136. I will ask you some questions later about this boy labour; did you give the Committee the number of boys and girls employed?
Yes, the boys and girls. The males under 18 years of age I gave as boys; they amount in the whole to 69 out of the 1,295.

6137. One thousand two hundred and nine-five men and boys?
Yes; 1,295 men and boys, and we have 69 boys.

6138. You do not count them as boys after the age of 18?
We should call them more youth labour.

6139. You could not give the Committee the numbers under the age of 21?
I could, decidedly, if the Committee asked me to prepare it; but those men, a good many of them, would be earning, perhaps, 30 *s.* to 2 *l.* per week.

6140. At what age do the boys generally come to you?
Directly they have passed the standard. They must be always under 21 years of age as apprentices, or you could not apprentice them, and, therefore, they must be under 16 years of age when they come to you, or else they could not be apprenticed.

6141. Are they apprenticed for five years?
Yes; and, therefore, they must be about 15 years of age when they come, and even less than that; 14 years of age.

6142. Would you include them among men before that five years is over?
No. You see the pay they would have after they have been with us four years in this particular stuffing department would be 1 *l.* a week.

6143. Then they would have to come to you at 13 years of age?
Yes, for the apprenticeship to end at 18. If they came to us at the age of 14, when they were 18 years of age they would get 1 *l.* a week.

6144. Perhaps you would give the Committee the numbers under 21 years of age?
A good many of the boys did not like answering the last question; I do not know what they will say about the next, but I will have it done, decidedly.

6145. Earl of *Derby.*] You cannot compel them to answer?
No; you cannot compel them to answer.

6146. *Chairman.*] But if a boy came to you at 14 or 15, he would not have concluded his five years' apprenticeship till he was 19 or 20; would you consider him a man before he had finished his five years' apprenticeship?
I do not know what the army standard is of the age of men; it depends entirely upon what your idea is; some people's idea is that a man is not a man till he is 25 years of age. But anything your Lordships' Committee like to have, I will endeavour to get you.

6147. I should like to have a distinction between the men and the boys that you employ. You have given us the number of males under 18 that you employ?
Yes.

6148. It appears to me that to call them men while they are still serving their term of apprenticeship would not be quite correct?
The whole number of apprentices altogether, apprenticed in this way, is very small. I should doubt if at the present moment there are 30 on the premises.

6149. I think probably if you will give us the number under the age of 21 that would do?
I will have a canvass made. I presume that if I send it to your Lordships that will be sufficient. I have been some days on this work; it has thrown me out of other duties.

6150. Any other witness may give the information, if you cannot?
Thank you.

6151. I want now to call your attention to a reply of Mr. Edmund Holland at No. 5298. I will begin at the commencement. Question 5295, Mr. Holland is asked: "Is there any sub-contracting in your business?" and he says, "Yes. (*Q.*) To a great extent?—(*A.*) Yes, to a great extent. (*Q.*) And has it always existed?—(*A.*) It has always existed, but not so badly as at the present moment." Then he is asked: "To what do you attribute its being worse now?" and his answer is: "To the greater number of workers that there are, certainly, and to the jobs being given out to sub-contractors, who have no men and no workshops." You would not agree with Mr. Holland perhaps as to the greater number of workers, or would you agree with that?
I think there is no doubt that there are a greater number of workers, but in proportion to the quantity of work required, I do not know that there are. I have got no reason for expressing a decided opinion one way or the other. There is a much larger quantity of work required, and there are a great many more to produce the work, there is no doubt.

6152. Now as to this definition of sweating as sub-contracting, in your opinion does the sweating system exist in the cabinet making and upholstery trade, defined as sub-contracting?
It seems to me that a sweater is a person who pays such low wages that it is difficult for the workman to earn sufficient in the time prescribed by the Factory Acts to maintain himself and his family. That would be my definition.

6153. But I am asking you now as to the definition of it as sub-contracting?

I do

I do not think that sub-contracting increases the necessity for sweating in all trades.

6154. I am asking you whether in your opinion sub-contracting exists in the cabinet making and upholstery trades; whether you agree with what Mr. Holland said as to that?

I should wish your Lordship to more clearly define the word "sub-contracting." If you mean that because I buy of someone who causes anything to be produced in a factory or workshop, therefore I am sub-contracting, then I am sub-contracting; I would become a sub-contractor if you contend that, because I buy from a person who produces, I am sub-contracting. But inasmuch as my firm only buy from manufacturers who produce their articles in a workshop or factory, I do not see how the word "sweater" can possibly attach.

6155. I was not alluding to your firm at all when I asked the question; I asked whether in your opinion the sub-contracting complained of exists in the trade at all?

By the nature of the trade it can only exist to a very small extent, because a wardrobe is a large piece of furniture, and work like that cannot be put out excepting into factories. A chest of drawers is a large and bulky piece of furniture and has to be made in large shops?

6156. What about this work which is carried on in Bethnal Green and Curtain-road, for instance?

In those little small tables and those sort of things? No doubt they are produced at home in the houses of the poor; and towel horses. But they must be small articles of furniture to be produced in any private house. No large writing-table or dining-table, or any large piece of furniture; no piece of furniture that is in this room at the present time, for instance, could possibly be produced in an ordinary person's house, but it would have to be produced in a workshop.

6157. Then you think that sweating may be said to exist in what may be called the East-end trade, at Bethnal Green and Curtain-road, in the production of the cheapest kind of furniture?

The very cheapest kind, and small furniture.

6158. Would you agree with Mr. Holland, that articles can be made excessively cheap there. At No. 5333, the question, "How has that sub-letting arisen in consequence of the demand for cheapness; I do not see the connection between the two things? and Mr. Holland says, "If you go into the East-end of London, among the cabinet makers there, you will find (I do not know how on earth they do it) things are there which I could not produce for the price in the West-end. Now, as an example that I can give you, I have got a dinner-waggon in my own place that I bought the other day for 2 *l.* 12 *s.* 6 *d.* I cannot make it in my own place under about 3 *l.* 3 *s.*" Do you agree with that?

I think that is perfectly correct.

6159. That these articles are produced much cheaper in the East-end?

Yes. What you might call the plain cabinet-maker at the East-end would perhaps not earn more than 6 *d.* per hour, whereas the best men, either at the West-end or at the East-end (if working there) would get 9 *d.* per hour; but it is owing to the fact that the class of trade at the East-end attracts the cheap workers there, whereas the West-end only attracts the best workers.

6160. Do you know what kind of work is made at the East-end, in Bethnal Green, and Curtain-road?

You can see it very well indeed; and years ago, in our early days, we used to have to buy a lot of that description of low-class furniture, but now we have no demand for it. The working classes do not come to us for furniture. We have what you might call the medium class and up to the very highest classes of furniture, but we have no demand for the very commonest furniture now, on our premises.

6161. You have no orders for common furniture?

No, we have none of those customers; the mechanics do not buy from us, and the very small shopkeepers, and so on, do not buy from us.

6162. For instance, in executing an order for furnishing an hotel or a large building, or an order for abroad, how about the furniture for the servants' rooms and things of that kind; where would that kind of furniture come from?

That would be made by a factory at the East-end, the deal japanned work and so on; it would be cut out by machinery, and put together and painted, and so on, in one of these factories. But we do not have the lowest class of that class of furniture. A 3-ft. chest of drawers you could have perhaps down as low as 12 *s.*; the lowest, I should think, at our place would be about 18*s.* 6*d.* It is a better standard; it is the lowest price at which we could sell such an article that, we think, would give substantial and satisfactory wear.

6163. As to this contracting or sub-contracting, I would ask your attention to the answer to Question 2862 in the evidence of Mr. Parnell, on page 279. He said there: "As an illustration of what I mean, I will say that if a firm gets an order to supply furniture to a customer, and the firm which gets that order does not itself manufacture the furniture, but gives it out to a sub-contractor, that is the first step in sweating." Would you agree with that?

No; because if the man who manufactures the furniture, the manufacturer, was to try and get orders from customers, to wait upon them, to deliver the goods in the vans and carts, to find the capital to trust the customer, and to carry out the different working arrangements, the manufacturer would not be able to carry on his business without very heavy expense, and a very much greater expense than the expenses that would belong to the retail trader who bought the article from the manufacturer, including also his profit. To give you an example, supposing that we get, for argument's sake, 15 per cent. on an article; we buy an article for 85 *l.*, say, and sell it for 100 *l.*; I will take that by way of illustration. We have got 15 *l.* out of that. From the 15 *l.* there are the attendant working expenses; the show rooms, waiting upon the customers, the salesmen, clerks, attendant upon it, and the touching the furniture up, examining the furniture, and then sending the furniture home. Now if this manufacturer was to go and try and get the orders from the public themselves, he could not work at 15 per cent.; the 15 per cent. of profit would not pay him for the extra trouble that he would have attendant upon it; and the fact is that you would find that these manufacturers would themselves all become retailers and dispense with our services, if it was to their advantage.

6164. Mr. Parnell goes on to say: "When these steps go from one to two, three, four, or five degrees, it is quite evident, and every man will admit, that that is sweating;" would you agree with that?

I cannot agree with his proposition; I do not find his proposition existent. I think that it is always a question of supply and demand. No customer is going to pay more for an article than he can buy it for elsewhere, if he knows it; and a manufacturer is not going to sell you a thing for 2 *l.* if he can sell it to somebody else and get 3 *l.*

6165. In your opinion, no amount of sub-contracting can be called sweating; sweating cannot be defined as sub-contracting?

I cannot see that sweating can be defined as sub-contracting. If I, A., like to pay a higher price to B., and B. buys from C., who buys from D., surely I, A., must be a bad business man to allow B. and C. to make their profits; why do I not go to D. myself.

6166. At any rate, you do not consider that sub-contracting can be described as sweating?

Not sub-contracting. I have explained what I think is decidedly sweating. I gave you a definition of a sweater as a person who pays such low wages that it is difficult for the workman to earn sufficient, in the time prescribed by the Factory Acts, to maintain himself and his family.

6167. But

6167. But unless that was a condition produced by sub-contracting, you would not say that sub-contracting was sweating, or that it was an evil?
No.

6168. I will now call your attention to what was said in evidence about your furnishing a house in France belonging to Baron Edmund de Rothschild; that was objected to in the evidence?
Yes.

6169. In that case your firm contracted to furnish a portion of his house?
We had orders placed with us to do the house.

6170. And you very naturally, inevitably, I might say, obtained the various articles that you do not make yourself, from others?
From good tradespeople; manufacturers themselves.

6171. And you would object to that being called sub-contracting or sweating?
Most decidedly.

6172. It was also alleged that men who were there, working for these other houses, were told to represent themselves as working for Maple & Co.; is that the case?
That is no doubt the case, because we are responsible for the men, and the customer would look upon them as Maple's men; the servants in the house would expect them to be Maple's men; therefore, no doubt when these men were asked where they came from, they would say, from Maple's; and Mr. Hughes, who manufactured the particular articles that these men went to fix, would not be known to Baron de Rothschild's people, and, consequently, the servants would hardly give them admittance. And, again, we were responsible for those men.

6173. It is the custom in your house, if you have a contract to furnish a house, to insist that the men who are sent there by other firms doing portions of the work for you, shall represent themselves as working for Maple & Company?
I do not think there is any such thing as "insisting"; it is done in every trade and by every firm.

6174. It is the case in your firm, and in all other firms, you say?
And in all other firms. In building a house, the marble mantel-pieces, and so on, are not made by the builder.

6175. That is not the question. The men who are putting those mantel-pieces up would not represent themselves as coming from the house that supplied them, but as coming from Maple & Co.?
Decidedly; or as coming from the builders; and the same also with all the tile paving that are in a house, or the grates that are fixed in a house, or the parquet flooring.

9176. Who would you get your tiles from?
From the different makers of tiles; there are heaps of makers of tiles.

6177. They would send their own men with these tiles to put them down, but they would say they have come from Maple & Co.?
With regard to that, I think we have tile fixers of our own. But if they were pressed, they would say that they came from us; or, if they went to do it for a builder, they would say that they represented that builder. They would not volunteer a lie, and say that they were Maple's men, or that they were the builder's men; but they would say that they represented Maples, or the builder.

6178. I think in that case it was stated that the men were compelled to represented themselves as coming from Maples'; that they had labels with Maples' name upon their boxes?
That is, I think, what you may call drawing the long bow. We always have printed labels, such as people have, and no doubt this man affixed one of these labels to his box; but it is too absurd to think that any foreman would take the

trouble of labelling a man's box, "From Maple's" You must remember that this evidence given to your Lordships is hearsay evidence that you are relying upon. It is not the evidence of the man who did it; it is only hearsay evidence, as most of the evidence has been.

6179. Mr. Arnold White says, in answer to Question 2211: "Where the misrepresentation comes in seems to be here. When Mr. Ball, the manager of Maples', visited the château to see how the work was going on, and heard from Mr. Peterson, who was regarded as the foreman, that the Baron had been told by Bottière that he and Mr. Holl were not assisting the other men, because they did not come from the same firm, he was very indignant, and told the men that they must consider themselves as all working for Maple, and had no business to tell Baron Rothschild they did not work for the same firm as some of the other men;" would that be correct, do you suppose?

I have made inquiries about these two men, and I find that they went over to fix some particular work; the work had not arrived, and they did not proceed to do any work; and when Ball saw them he said: "You came here to do work, which you are paid for by the hour, and you ought to apply yourselves to work and to assist the other men;" and they went and did the work.

6180. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Your firm, I suppose, had to pay them anyhow for their time?

We should; they had to be paid for their time from the time they left England, and all their attendant expenses.

6181. *Chairman.*] Your firm would pay them, would they?

Yes.

6182. They would not be paid by the firm from which they came?

No, they would be paid by our firm.

6183. Lord *Clinton.*] And the order came from your firm?

Yes, the order was given to the men by our firm.

6184. *Chairman.*] In fact you would find fault with a man for not representing himself as coming from Maple & Co., under those circumstances?

The man would, in all probability, not be brought in contact with anyone. When he went into the house, it would be only natural, when asked where he came from, for him to say, "from Maple & Co."

6185. In this case the man did not say so; he said that he came from somebody else. What I want to ask you is, whether your representative there would resent that, and tell the man that is was an improper thing to do, and that he ought to represent himself as coming from Maple & Co.?

Mr. Ball, who will come before your Lordships (if you think it is worth while to get all these little minor details confirmed), can come and tell you that such a conversation never occurred as that they should represent that they came from us. It was by way of a scolding for these men for not doing the work, because they said that they were waiting for some particular job that would be produced from Hughes.

6186. I did not understand you to say, in answer to the questions I asked you, that you denied the fact?

I deny the fact that these men were asked to represent themselves as coming from us. I am going only on hearsay evidence, from inquiries made from Mr. Ball; but my traducer here, Mr. Arnold White, only gives his evidence on hearsay evidence.

6187. My last question appeared to me to put the question clearly. I asked you whether, in the event of the man representing himself as coming from the firm employed by you, instead of as coming direct from you, your representative there would resent it, and tell him it was an improper thing?

I do not think so. No, we should not object to anyone saying, "I come from Mr. Hughes, who is working for Maple." We do not mind our customers knowing it one iota; there is no sin in it; there is nothing wrong.

6188. Your

6188. Your firm puts out a great deal of work, does it not; gets a great deal of its work done outside?

We are of necessity bound to; it is impossible to manufacture everything we sell; if we did we should require, I should think, from 15,000 to 20,000 work-people.

6189. How is it put out; can you explain to the Committee how the process is carried out; for instance, how many men do you employ in this way at the present moment; to how many manufacturers do you put out work at the present moment?

We buy any quantity, I might say. A manufacturer comes and submits an article, and we may have the one transaction in the year, or we may have 200 in the year with him.

6190. I understand you that you manufacture a certain amount of goods on your own premises; is that so?

Yes.

6191. You also employ a firm in Islington who manufacture entirely for you?

Yes.

6192. Then beyond that are there any particular firms to whom you give out work; when you get an order how do you manage?

Hundreds of firms.

6193. If you get an order which you cannot execute on your own premises, or in your factory, what takes place then; how do you put out that order?

That order is ordered from the best manufacturer to produce that article. One manufacturer will produce a particular sideboard best; another will produce another sideboard best; another manufacturer produces a dining-table best. So with all descriptions of furniture; certain workshops have a greater capability than others of producing certain articles.

6194. Are there no particular manufacturers with whom you generally deal?

With a business of the magnitude of ours the quantity of manufacturers we deal with is enormous.

6195. You get the work done wherever you think you can get it done most to your satisfaction?

Most to our satisfaction, and in view of its being serviceable and strong, because everything we sell we are responsible for.

6196. That would come under the description of being to your satisfaction?

And the same people who manufacture for us manufacture for the West-end firms; and not only the West-end firms, but the best firms throughout the provinces.

6197 When you get a large order for an hotel, or to go abroad, or something of that kind, how do you make known the fact; how do these manufacturers know that this order is to be executed?

They are not bound to know; our business is so large. For instance, we opened the Hotel Métropole, which was 100,000 *l.* the one order; and I think two other hotels were opened just about the same time, and still our ordinary business was carried on.

6198. Quite so; but excuse my ignorance in the matter; but I want to find out how these orders become known to the trade. Do you send out to men in the habit of working for you and say, "We want such-and-such things made," or do these men come to you and ask whether you want any work done?

They come to us; they are continually coming; we might have an order to-day for something we wanted produced, and we have sent a postcard or, if the matter pressed, a telegram, to the man to come to our place to receive instructions.

6199. The men would come themselves to ask if there was anything for them to do?
Yes.

6200. And if you wanted them, you would write and tell them to come?
Yes. Would you like me to explain more fully the way it is done? For instance, take an hotel; you decide first of all what pieces of furniture you are going to put in each room, we have our designers, and all the principal rooms are set out on drawings and plans as to where the furniture will stand in the different rooms, and then as to sizes; then, when we have settled those questions, we commence to allot out the different sorts of furniture that we require for the different rooms. Then we produce a certain quantity ourselves, but we also take the best people we consider necessary to produce any of those articles, and they are put down ready to submit to them.

6201. You furnish estimates, I suppose?
Very seldom.

6202. If a customer wants a drawing-room furnished, or something of that sort, do you not furnish him with an estimate of the cost?
Sometimes, but very seldom. I had an order given me the other day for doing the Hotel Victoria; my order was 45,000 *l.*, and so great is our reputation that that order was placed entirely in my hands, to supply the furniture for that hotel for 45,000 *l.*; and my bill was sent in "For furnishing hotel, 45,000 *l.*;" and I supplied what I liked, and what I thought was right and proper.

6203. They told you to supply them with as much furniture as would cost 45,000 *l.*?
That is so.

6204. Is that the custom of private individuals too?
Sometimes; but in our stock all our things are marked in plain figures.

6205. But if a man is furnishing his own private house, and he wants bedroom furniture, is it not customary for him to know what it would cost?
Yes.

6206. And also to know what he is going to get for the cost?
Yes; and so large is our stock, that he would come and choose that furniture from stock at the price that it is marked

6207. But what if it has to be made for him?
That is an exceptional thing altogether, for a thing to be made, because our stock is so large that ordinary people will come there and see what they require. If an article has to be made to a special drawing, we make special drawings ourselves for those articles, and we submit a price for them.

6208. You would make certain drawings and say that the price of the article was so-and-so?
Yes, but generally speaking a customer would say, "I want a wardrobe; let it cost about 30 *l.*;" and our drawing would be made so as to produce an article that we could supply for 30 *l.*

6209. If you made a design, what would you base the price upon; what it would cost you to make?
What the article would be worth. If a man understands his business he knows how to value things. I, myself, could value anything in this room, or in the whole of any hotel, right throughout from beginning to end, and I would undertake to produce it for the prices that I would quote.

6210. Supposing I, or anybody else, were to say "I want such-and-such furniture, of such-and-such a character for my room," would you make me an estimate?
Yes.

6211. You would give me the drawings, and the estimate?
Yes.

6212. I ask

6212. I ask you what you would found the estimate upon?
Upon my knowledge of the production of the article.

6213. You mean your knowledge of what it would cost you to produce the article on your premises?
Or to get it produced.

6214. To get it produced where?
By the best people to produce that class of article.

6215. Do you mean at your factory, or outside?
Outside, or at our factory. Some things we could get produced cheaper at home, and some things we could get produced for us cheaper out. As we guarantee the quality of everything we sell, it cannot matter whether the thing is produced in our own workshops or outside.

6216. I get my design, I get my estimate, my price; then we will suppose that you do not make it on your premises, but you get it done outside; do you invite tenders to make the article?
No; we send to a maker and say, "This is what we want; we want this made," and we describe it to him. Take a wardrobe, for instance. We may say, "We want it made one part hanging, one part drawers and trays (as it is called in the trade); we want this work here carved, that fluted; we want the inside of the drawers so that they should run nice and smooth, to be mahogany," for instance, supposing it is a walnut wardrobe; and so you describe exactly what you want, and then we say, "We think that you ought to produce that for so-and-so."

6217. Mentioning a price?
Mentioning the price. If the man says "Yes, I will take it for that," he takes the order away and produces it, and when he brings the article in he is paid that price, and never less.

6218. You do not bring two or three or more of these manufacturers into competition with each other to produce a given article?
It is not worth while unless you are wanting a lot of articles, and unless also you cannot agree with the first man. For instance, take that case of Richard's referring to one particular order. He and two other makers, as he says, produced samples. Those samples came in. He was offered an order to make them at a certain price which we considered to be the proper value for those articles. He could either take the order or refuse the order. He refused the order. It was then given to another manufacturer who took the order at the prices that he refused, and the articles were made by him.

6219. I will take the case, taking a suppositious case, of a large order costing a considerable sum of money, and one of these manufacturers sends you in a sample of whatever it may be?
Say a sideboard.

6220. A sideboard, or whatever it is, for a certain price, and that you select. Suppose, then, other men offer to make the same thing at a less price, you would then select the lowest offer, I suppose?
If a man was to make a sideboard, a pattern for us, so great is our experience and our knowledge, that if that sideboard came in, and he wanted 35 *l.* for it, we could at once decide whether that was value for the money, or if we wanted work taken out of it we could tell him what quantity of work we wanted taken out of it, less carving in it, or less mouldings in it, and so we could tell the cost to which it should be reduced; and if the man then says, "Here is a sideboard for which I require 35 *l.*," and we say "No, that is too much, it is only worth 30 *l.*," he has the option at all times of taking the 30 *l.* or refusing the order.

6221. What I mean is this, supposing manufacturer A. sends in his sample and says, "I supply this article for, whatever it may be, say 50 *l.*," and you are satisfied, would he get that order, although manufacturer B. might come and say I can do it for 45 *l.*?

I do not think he would; if one manufacturer would produce an equally good article for 45 *l.* to that which another was producing for 50 *l.*, there would be no reason to give the 50 *l.*

6222. You would give it to the lowest tenderer?
Decidedly, provided that we were sure of its being an equally good article.

6223. Though a price was agreed with the first man?
If the price was agreed, the 50 *l.* for a sideboard, 50 *l.* would be paid for that sideboard.

6224. And if a number of sideboards were to be made, he would get the order for the lot, would he?
If he was to send in a sample sideboard for an order, and we happened to want 20 of those sideboards, which would be an extraordinary thing, he would charge us 50 *l.* for the one sent in, and we should say, "We think that we are going to order a lot of these sideboards; you can produce them cheaper," which he would be able to do by making them 20 at a time, because the work would be got out in larger quantities and done in different ways that would really save in the production. Other manufacturers might be asked what they would do it for, and whoever was the lowest would get the order. When he had made his first sideboard he would send that sideboard in, well knowing that such would be the case.

6225. What I meant was, does this, did this happen: say you want a number of sideboards, and a manufacturer sends in one as a sample, and says, "I can make that at a certain price," and you say, "Very well, that will do;" would he not understand that he would get the order for the whole of those sideboards?
No, decidedly not.

6226. Then what would he understand?
That he made a sample for us to approve of at a price; that sample comes in and he is paid for it.

6227. But he would not consider, you think, that he was to make all at that price?
No, decidedly not; never is such a thing understood. The contract made was made for one sideboard, and at that price the sideboard would be paid for.

6228. I think you alluded to Mr. Richards in your evidence?
Yes, I did.

6229. You see that in his answer to Question 4558 there is a case somewhat similar to that which I have suggested. He there says, "I made six suites and sent them in, and also an invoice of my prices. I was requested to attend on a particular day at Messrs. Maple's, and I did so. They had the various suites set out in a room specially arranged for the purpose. My suites were selected by their customer, and I was so informed by Messrs. Maple's representative, and I naturally expected the order to proceed with the work." Would he naturally, or any other man under similar circumstances, expect the order to proceed with the work?
He asserts what is not correct in the first place; because he was requested to send in with other firms samples of bedroom furniture. I had to do with this order myself; it is an order which we had placed entirely in our hands (it was for the North Eastern Hotel at York), to do in the way which I considered most advantageous for our customers, and I had personally the carrying out of that order. Certain articles that were used were after his designs and shapes, but some others of the articles were altered.

6230. Some others of the articles?
Yes; when there is a bedroom suite, you must understand that there are perhaps in a bedroom seven or eight pieces of furniture, perhaps more, and this man here would make you believe that exactly as he sent the furniture so it was made, and, as he says, there were 300 or 400 suites of it produced.

6231. What

6231. What he says here is this: "Mr. Regnart told me they had no price given, and that they wanted the three qualities to see which their customers would select;" is that correct?

No, not three qualities, because they were all the same quality of goods.

6232. I suppose he means, not three qualities, but three different patterns?

Three different ideas; when Richards came, he was told what we wanted, given a description of them, and a general idea of the shapes that we wanted, and then he and each of these other makers had to see at what price they could produce a suite of furniture and send it in. They produced these suites and sent them in.

6233. He says, "I made six suites, and sent them in;" that is correct?

That is no doubt correct; I will not dispute the facts; you must remember that this is 14 or 15 years since, and it is rather a tax on one's memory to go into all these cases.

6234. I am rather taking this as a typical case. Then he says, "I was requested to attend on a particular day at Messrs. Maple's, and I did so," that is correct?

Yes.

6235. Then he says, "They had the various suites set out in a room specially arranged for the purpose." That, I presume, may be taken to be correct; and then he says, "My suites were selected by their customer;" would that be the case?

No, not in their entirety, because I had lots of alterations made in the different designs.

6236. Before they were submitted?

No, when they were submitted. But the order being placed with me, some of the directors called, and I showed them the class of articles that I proposed putting in some of the rooms; and then after they had gone (I had had the order then some weeks to do), after they had left the premises, I proceeded to get the sample furniture that I should use made, and I offered Richards to make these things at a certain price; as he says, I offered him, in fact (which may be true, because I cannot remember) 19 *l.* 10 *s.* to make a quantity of wardrobes, instead of 22 *l.* 15 *s.* He refused to take the prices which I considered fair for him to have for the goods, and then I submitted these prices to another manufacturer, and it only endorses my opinion that I was right, and proves to your Committee that I was right, for this other manufacturer takes the orders at those prices that Richards refused. Now, I should have been very unfair and unjust to those people that I gave the order to if, when these manufacturers said, "We will do the wardrobes for 19 *l.* 10 *s.*," I was to have gone away from them and given the order to Mr. Richards for 22 *l.* 15 *s.*

6237. What you would deny, I presume, in this statement, is that Mr. Richards was "informed by Messrs. Maples' representative," that his sample had been selected?

I deny that entirely, that his sample was selected by the customer. Some of his furniture, as regards design, was accepted; but he had made it for me to my order, and I paid him the price he charged.

6238. But gave the order to another manufacturer to proceed with the work?

Then I wanted some more; I wanted to give an order afterwards. He made me a suite of furniture, and for that I paid him the price he asked. Then I wanted some other furniture made, and I offered him a price to take the order at, and he refused the price.

6239. Lord *Thring.*] Some other furniture exactly the same as Richards had made?

Yes, in some of the cases; but Richards, you will quite understand, could make the wardrobe cheaper by making a dozen of them than by making one.

6240. *Chairman.*] I suppose when he sent the samples in he was aware that if they were accepted there would be a large order; he was competing, in fact, for a large order?

When he sent in his first order, he sent in his prices with the things, which we paid.

6241. And he would be aware that if he got the order it would be a large one? But he would be equally aware that he would not get that price for them.

6242. Do you mean that he did not invoice his goods with the price fixed, with the knowledge that if he got the order he would have a large order to execute?
No.

6243. Would he not have invoiced them lower if he had known that?
He would know that he would be sure to get the price for the sample suite that he sent it in at; and that price was only right for producing one suite of a pattern, and his prices were charged for the one suite; but by producing a quantity of those suites, there would have been a great saving to him, which saving we asked him to give to our customer, because we charge in proportion to the price that it costs.

6244. Lord *Monkswell.*] What I understand you to say is this, that he did not send any invoice price for a large order at all?
Yes.

6245. The invoice price, as you understood it, was the price for the sample suite?
For the one suite; and it was no doubt in proportion to the cost of one suite.

6246. Lord *Clinton.*] He was not asked for a price for the order?
No.

6247. *Chairman.*] Then you informed him that the order was a large one, and that there must be a reduction in the price?
Yes; and he says in the evidence that he refused to accept it.

6248. And another man at that price got the order?
Yes.

6249. He goes on at the end of that answer to say: "It must be obvious that if Messrs. Maple had made these samples themselves they would have had to pay the full labour price for making, and that would have left the other honestly-competing firms a much better chance of obtaining the order, and it would also have prevented them from sweating the labour price down to the price which they actually did." Did I understand that to mean that if you had made these on your own premises, you would have been able to judge of the cost better than you did?
We were able to judge of the price of the things that were produced, because they were actually produced by another firm, who paid equally good wages with Richards, at the price that we estimated.

6250. I understand the contention of this witness to be, that you got the articles cheaper than they ought to have been made at by this process of competition between the various firms, by what has sometimes been designated before the Committee as sweating, that is, sub-contracting; but that, if you had made the goods yourselves on your own premises, you would have got at the true value of them, and would have ascertained that his offer was a fair one, and that he could not make them any cheaper. That, I understand, is what he means.
I cannot understand what he means; because this is part of a written statement that he reads to you. Evidently, if we manage our workshops properly, we ought to be able to manufacture as cheaply in our workshops as Mr. Richards was able to manufacture in his workshop.

6251. That is exactly what he contends?
And as cheaply also as the other manufacturers who produced the articles.

6252. What I understand from this is that Mr. Richards maintains that you cannot fix a fair price by submitting the goods to competition?
That is the way to come at a fair price.

6253. But

6253. But his contention is that a fair price can only be ascertained by manufacturing them on your own premises?

That can equally well be ascertained by firms being asked to give their price, one against the other. Unless builders had competition, and private people had their houses put up to competition, in building or anything of the sort, how could you be certain that you are not being robbed. Mr. Richards might be charging us here a great deal more for those articles than they were possibly worth, and the only way we could arrive at it was to either manufacture the articles ourselves or to ask another firm what they would manufacture them for.

6254. As a matter of fact, then, can you manufacture on your own premises as cheaply as you can buy in goods?

Decidedly, or else we should not manufacture. Why should we manufacture to pay a greater price to the manufacturers than what we could buy them for.

6255. I only ask you the fact, whether you can manufacture as cheaply as you can buy in goods?

We are now building a very large lot of factories, putting some more steam boilers down and machinery; and we should not do those things unless we could produce as cheap as we could buy them.

6256. And do you think that the work that is done by these manufacturers who work for you is as good in quality as that which the best West End firms produce?

I say, without doubt, that I can get things made by manufacturers who work for the trade, as good as any that you can get from any shop in England.

6257. You say that the work you buy in is as good as can be made in any West End shop in London?

Yes.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Martis, 3° *Julii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of DERBY.
Earl of ONSLOW.
Lord CLINTON.
Lord CLIFFORD OF CHUDLEIGH.
Lord FOXFORD (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord MONKSWELL.
Lord THRING.

LORD KENRY (EARL OF DUNRAVEN AND MOUNT-EARL), IN THE CHAIR.

MR. JOHN BLUNDELL MAPLE (a Member of the House of Commons), is further Examined, as follows:

6258. *Chairman.*] THIS system of buying in work, I presume, is pretty general in the trade, is it not?
It is.

6259. Should I be correct in saying that the tendency on the part of large firms is to manufacture less on their own premises, and to buy in more, in proportion to the total output?
In the old West-end firms, yes.

6260. Generally in the trade?
In our own case we are making more now than we ever did.

6261. Making more in proportion to what you buy in?
We are making more than formerly; we are manufacturing now, in proportion to what we buy in, more than we used to manufacture before.

6262. That is the case in your firm, you say; but which do you think is the general tendency of the trade; is it towards manufacturing more on their own premises, or is it towards buying in more?
I should think towards buying in more.

6263. You buy in from a great number of people?
An enormous quantity.

6264. A hundred?
A thousand, I might say, perhaps.

6265. Manufacturers?
Yes, taking manufacturers of all descriptions, I should say very likely; but it is a question I can hardly answer, because it would be so large a number.

6266. But a great number of manufacturers supply you with things?
Yes.

6267. Does not this cause a great deal of competition, more than formerly used to exist?
Not more than formerly.

6268. For instance, we will suppose half-a-dozen large firms compete for a large order; they would be in competition one with the other for that order?
Yes.

 6269. Then

6269. Then if each of these large firms put out the whole or a certain proportion of the work to a number of manufacturers, 100 or more, that would introduce another large element of competition, would it not?
No doubt it would.

6270. Then, is it possible that these manufacturers in their turn might put out the whole or part of that work?
None that I know of. We buy from people only who manufacture themselves

6271. How do you know that they only manufacture themselves?
Because our buyers and so on would tell you that they visit their workshops and see the things going on.

6272. You have the workshops of all these hundreds of men who manufacture for you visited by your buyers?
Yes.

6273. To see that the work is done on the premises?
Not for the purpose of seeing that; but they do see that it is done so.

6274. They do not do it for the purpose of seeing that?
They do not visit the workshops for that express purpose.

6275. Would it be possible for them to be certain that some of the work is not put out?
Yes, it would be possible for them to assert it. Mr. Regnart will be able to tell you about that.

6276. He can speak more definitely to that point than you can?
Yes.

6277. For instance, Mr. Parnell mentioned a case, without giving any names, at No. 2862, on page 279. He says, "I know of a case in which work has been obtained by a large firm and given out to a sub-contractor, who has given it out to another sub-contractor, who has given it out again to a man supposed to be his foreman, and the foreman has then given it out as piece-work to the workmen;" would you think that a usual thing?
No, far from usual; but I think he mentioned the name of a firm, Symes and Colville.

6278. He does not mention any name. There is no object that I know in mentioning the name?
Then Mr. Arnold White does in his opening statement.

6279. I was alluding to Mr. Parnell?
If you turn to the answer to Question 2135 you will see there that Mr. White refers to what Mr. Parnell is going to say.

6280. Yes, but that is not my question. What Mr. Parnell says (this is in his answer to Question 2862) is this: "I know of a case in which work has been obtained by a large firm and given out to a sub-contractor, who has given it out to another sub-contractor, who has given it out again to a man supposed to be his foreman, and the foreman has then given it out as piece-work to the workmen." That gives what I may call perhaps a typical case. I ask whether you think that that is likely to occur?
I should not think there would be one case that would occur in 10,000.

6281. Mr. Regnart would be able to speak on that point if I want to ask more questions on it?
Yes.

6282. Can you speak at all as to the trade in the East End. For instance, in your knowledge is it true that a large number of foreign Jews are employed in the East End trade in Curtain-road and Bethnal Green?
Not to my own knowledge; I think very few indeed from what I hear.

6283. To

6283. To your knowledge are boy labourers largely employed in the East End?
Not beyond what is usual?

6284. You do not think that they have largely supplanted adult labour?
I do not. Machinery, in fact, takes away a lot of what then used to be called the sweating work done by this boy labour, the planing, sawing, and all that; and with regard to the sand-papering after the rough saw, now the sawing is done so beautifully that it comes out all done without requiring the sand-papering that used to be done by boys.

6285. Can you speak at all authoritatively as to the condition of things in the East End?
No, I cannot. As I said before, I have not visited the East End for some years.

6286. Would Mr. Regnart be able to give us information on that?
Yes, and some other manufacturers that I propose calling; they would be the best authorities.

6287. I think you told us the other day that there was some competition on the part of foreign manufacturers, that foreign manufactured goods come into competition with those manufactured in this country?
There is a great deal of manufactured goods as regards, for instance, the Austrian chairs, the bent-wood chairs; the quantity that come to England now is something enormous, supplanting all the old-fashioned chairs which used to be produced. Then there is also coming to this country a very large quantity of American furniture and all the foreign parquet that is produced. That furniture is produced near to where the timber is, and machinery being applied so much to the manufacture, machinery is sent right out to these places, and the timber is dried there and cut up; and I regret exceedingly to have to say so, but I think that in the future things will be much worse in that way. You can quite understand that in the case of enormous logs of wood coming to this country, it is very expensive in moving them, shipping them, loading them, and unloading them; whereas if they are dried and the machinery is taken to the forests where the timber is, then it is cut up there. And you will find that not only in our trade, in the cabinet-making, but also in the quantity of doors coming from Sweden. The most extraordinary thing that I have seen lately is an easy chair that is just coming over from Gothenburg, a most extraordinary chair for production, costing about 3 *s.* 6 *d.* a chair, which I am sure we could not get produced here for 6 *s.* or 7 *s.*

6288. Is that a wooden chair?
A wooden chair. If your Lordships would like I will have one sent for, for you to see, but I am afraid that in the future we shall suffer still more in that way, because the amount of timber that is grown in England is now so small, and is not so applicable as that which we find in the forests abroad.

6289. In fact, you say that although there is considerable competition on the part of foreign manufacturers, you apprehend that it will become more severe?
I do.

6290. But you export largely abroad, do you not?
That is in the higher class things. The tariffs are excessively against us in exporting, and the tariffs with our Colonies are very bad.

6291. Do you export much to the Colonies?
Yes; not so much now, because they have imposed a heavy duty against us.

6292. Do you think that anything tending to increase the cost of production here would tend to stimulate the importation of foreign goods into this country?
Machinery is cheapening the production here enormously.

6293. I meant rather any interference, legislative or otherwise, with the trade?
If there was a prohibition on certain articles, or a tax imposed on certain articles,

articles, there is no doubt that the prices would rise and the working classes would be better paid.

6294. I do not think you quite apprehend my question. What I asked you was whether, in the event of anything increasing the cost of production here, that would stimulate the importation of foreign manufactured goods?
Decidedly.

6295. When you spoke of your turnover, did you include in that the bought-in work as well as what you manufacture on your premises?
I meant the sales; that is, the whole thing.

6296. Can you tell the Committee at all what proportion your bought-in work would bear to what you manufacture yourselves, taking those articles, I mean, which you do manufacture yourselves?
I should think we might manufacture ourselves about one-third.

6297. One-third of what you buy in?
Yes, the proportion would be as one to three. You see, all bedding and so on we manufacture ourselves.

6298. Any other questions that I want to ask about the East End of London, competition, and so on, I can get answered by another witness?
I think you will get that better from Mr. Regnart and the other gentlemen who will follow.

6299. You tell us that you sell the materials to the manufacturers who make for you?
Yes.

6300. Do you insist upon their taking them?
No.

6301. And you say that your object in selling them the materials is to ensure that they use good material?
Yes. And by the ordering of a great many things; for instance, the marbles from Belgium (because we import those largely), by getting tiles made in large quantities, locks made in large quantities, brass-handles and hinges, and those things, made in large quantities, you reduce enormously the price of them.

6302. But you do not insist upon the manufacturers buying of you?
No, not at all.

6303. And you also sell them the absolute material for manufacture, wood, for instance?
Now during the last four or five years we have established large timber yards, and we sell them wood. We dry it ourselves, and as we are responsible for everything we sell, it secures it better; but even then we never insist upon their taking it from us.

6304. I see you say on page 572: "We should not have become timber merchants, and excited the trade jealousies by so doing, but we found it impossible to rely upon getting seasoned woods from the timber yards of other persons"?
You see, timber requires some years to season.

6305. Do you mean the Committee to infer from that that it is impossible to obtain proper seasoned timber from the regular trade?
No, I do not say that. What I meant the Committee to understand is that you can better rely upon it when you know how long timber has been stacked yourself, than you can in the case of a cabinet-maker going to a timber yard and asking for satin-wood, or bird's-eye maple, or some other woods. The timber merchant naturally wants to sell his timber, and he is not responsible for the article of furniture when it is made.

6306. It is not customary in the trade, is it, for firms to import timber themselves?
No, not generally.

6307. On

6307. On what terms do you sell the material to the men who manufacture for you?
Very low indeed.

6308. I suppose you receive a discount in making purchases yourselves?
That is a particular part of the business to which Mr. Regnart would speak. We buy timber under so many different conditions, sometimes from importers sometimes from private individuals.

6309. Mr. Regnart will be able to speak better on that point, you say?
Decidedly.

6310. I am not quite clear as to what is the regular trade discount in your trade; I think on some occasions we have had 2½ per cent. mentioned, and on some occasions 5 per cent.?
It is very irregular.

6311. I think Mr. Henry Miller said that he would have no objection to 5 per cent. discount; may we assume that 5 per cent. is the regular trade discount in your branch of business?
No; you must assume that 5 per cent. applies generally to deal-workers; but Mr. Regnart will explain it to you more fully still. It is always understood when buying what the discount should be; for instance, in certain materials some manufacturers in France give 6 per cent., others 5 per cent., others only 2½, and the same applies in England.

6312. With regard to these cabinet-makers who work for you, is 5 per cent. the ordinary trade discount in their case?
That Mr. Regnart will tell you more distinctly; but for that class of goods that Miller was manufacturing, yes; it is generally 5 per cent. on them.

6313. Earl of *Limerick.*] He said 9 *s.* off 18 *l.*, which would be 2½ per cent.?
That was in an answer of Van Damme's, I think.

6314. *Chairman.*] I may assume that the discount varies?
Very much.

6315. But that with cabinet-makers 5 per cent. is the regular thing?
In that particular class of goods.

6316. Then besides that, mention has been made of what has been called discount, but what appears to me to be better described, perhaps, as an allowance, an arbitrary deduction made for some cause or another?
Your Lordship will quite understand that dealing with the trade from 1874 until the present time, there has always been a falling market; you must not forget that. You will hear from Mr. Regnart, and from other cabinet-makers also, who will be called, the great alteration that has taken place in the different things: and therefore, sometimes, that alteration has occurred by getting an allowance by way of discount from the price paid for the article on the previous transaction.

6317. Mr. Deintje, I think it was, told the Committee that at various times various sums would be taken off his invoices, and this he attributed to bad workmanship?
That is, off an agreed price.

6318. I think you told the Committee that in cases of bad workmanship the work is generally returned to the manufacturer, but that occasionally, perhaps, a sovereign or two might be taken off and the article kept.
What was necessary to put the article right would be taken off in such a case.

6319. That appears to me scarcely to agree with what Mr. Deintje said; he gave the Committee to understand that sums, varying I think up to 10 per cent., were taken off on account of bad workmanship as a regular thing; but I gather from you that it is very rarely done?

Very rarely indeed; it is quite the exception. Your Lordship can quite understand that firms are not anxious to reduce the price of articles, because if they reduce on new stock they have to reduce that which they have got in stock; and if you hold, as a firm like our does, perhaps 300,000 *l.* or 400,000 *l.* worth of goods in stock, when you get a reduction of 10 per cent. your old stock has to suffer. And again, we should rather try to hold the standard than to decrease it; because, as our net profit is upon our returns, the larger the return the more the profit, and the less the return the less the profit.

6320. These arbitrary allowances or discounts——
They are never arbitrary.

6321. I will not use the word arbitrary. These discounts or sums of money taken off for some cause or another, are spoken of by a number of witnesses, Mr. Van Damme, Mr. Dickson, Mr. Brown, and Mr. Richards, and others?
That of Mr. Dickson's, as you see, is in 1874, and that is disowned to.

6322. I was merely going to ask you whether you generally deny that these deductions are made, or whether you can account for them in any way?
Not one is made, I should think, in 10,000 cases.

6323. They are very rarely made?
Very rarely.

6324. Earl of *Derby.*] And always for some definite reason?
And always for some definite reason.

6325. *Chairman.*] If any deduction was made would it show on the statement the cause of it?
The deduction should show on the statement or invoice.

6326. Not the cause of it?
No, not the cause; because it is agreed between the two people.

6327. The statement would merely show that so much is taken off for overcharge?
Yes. No one has ever been compelled to accept the conditions of purchase. If a person says, "I require 5 *l.* for an article," and my buyer says, "I will only give you 4 *l.* 10 *s.*," if he makes his invoice out for 5 *l.*, and deducts 10 *s.*, it will show a 10 *s.* allowance; but it was no less an arrangement made that the thing was to be only 4 *l.* 10 *s.*

6328. Earl of *Derby.*] In that case what is the object of putting 5 *l.* on the invoice?
I cannot tell you; unless it is only that the man might have got the invoice made out and put it down to show that he had made an allowance. The only object I should say would be this, that he would do it hoping that next time he brought the article in better finished he should get 5 *l.*, and be able to say, "That is the regular price; I allowed you the 10 *s.* because the other article was not well finished."

6329. *Chairman.*] What is the regular course of a transaction; a manufacturer gets an order, he brings in his work, and with it an invoice?
Yes.

6330. What does that invoice state, the price verbally agreed to?
Yes.

6331. Then you say if there is anything to come off the man would have put it in his invoice?
If there was such an exceptional case, because it is quite exceptional that anything would have to come off an agreed price. The buyer or manager of the department might say, "This article is not properly finished; you had better take it back, or allow us 10 *s.* and we will have it put right ourselves." He has the option of taking it back.

6332. Then

6332. Then that of course would not be mentioned on the invoice; it would be mentioned in the statement?
It would come in the statement generally.

6333. I understand the statement is made up of the invoices?
It might come off one or the other; I cannot say.

6334. But probably it would appear in the statement, such and such a price with so much taken off for overcharge?
Yes; it might be either way.

6335. If a man wants cash, to whom does he make his application, if he wants cash instead of a cheque, or wants his cheque cashed?
We always gives cheques for every payment over 4 *l.*; it is impossible for him to get cash in the first instance over 4 *l.*

6336. But I think that you said that occasionally to oblige your customers you gave cash?
I will explain. We always give cheques for everything over 4 *l.* Then if the recipient of the cheque wishes for cash, it is generally stamped across "Pay at counter," so that he may take the cheque to the Union Bank, our bankers. If it is for a small amount, and the man asks the cashier (which is quite an exceptional thing) to oblige him by cashing the cheque, the cashier would give him the cash out of his cash box in exchange for the cheque, but never charging one farthing.

6337. The cashier is the person he would apply to?
The person who gives him the cheque is the cash clerk, and he would apply to him.

6338. If a man wants money to pay his workmen with, would the first person to whom he would make the application for cash be the cash clerk; he would not say, for instance, to the head of the department, "I want to get cash."
Oh, no.

6339. The first person to whom he would mention it would be to the cash clerk?
The cash clerk.

6340. And the cash clerk might sometimes give him cash for his cheque?
Or else have the cheque made open. I think you will find when you come to examine my two cash clerks that they will tell you that they have never known anyone to be refused either having the cheque made open, or else being given the cash for it.

6341. Is a man's statement given to him before he goes for his cheque?
Yes.

6342. Then he knows exactly what he is going to receive?
Decidedly; always.

6343. Would the cash clerk make an entry in the books in the case of paying cash against a cheque?
No, there is no necessity for that; he simply gives cash in place of a cheque.

6344. The cheque passes, of course?
Yes.

6345. Then you have no means of knowing whether that is done often or not?
You will hear. At the present time I should doubt whether there would be two cases a week.

6346. Earl of *Onslow.*] But the Chairman asked you whether you would have any means of checking the cash clerk?
No, I should not, because it would be really done as a great favour to the holder of the cheque; but there is no necessity for it when you can get the cash, within 10 minutes, from the bank.

6347. *Chairman.*] As you said yourself, your books would not show it if a fraudulent clerk in cashing a cheque charged discount?
No.

6348. Lord *Sandhurst.*] They cash those cheques at the bank, do they, though the man himself may not have an account there?
Yes; they cash a cheque at the Union Bank directly it is stamped and made an open cheque.

6349. *Chairman.*] At the present time you close at two o'clock on Saturdays, and the bank closes at two?
Yes.

6350. And therefore, in the case of a man wanting money, it would be convenient to him to get his cheque before two o'clock on Saturday?
I do not suppose there is ever a cheque given now, or has been for some time, after one to half-past one; but when Miller was in receipt of cheques the banks were open until three o'clock, and we closed at two.

6351. You mentioned before the Committee that you made a special arrangement with the branch of the City Bank in Tottenham Court-road; what was that?
The arrangement was made when the City Bank opened the branch in Tottenham Court-road. Mr. Gliddon asked me to recommend people to bank with them, and said that it would be a convenience for those people, being so close, if they could take their cheques in, and I might tell anyone that they could always draw cash out in respect of the cheque. That was some years previous to Mr. Kirby becoming the manager of that bank; and he tells you that he found it in existence, though he was unaware of the arrangement; but, considering that he was not at the bank then, that is not astonishing.

6352. I think you said also that that arrangement was made to meet a particular necessity, a possible difficulty?
A possible difficulty, in that they would want money at once.

6353. But even at that time, when the banks were open up to three o'clock, a manufacturer would have to have an account with the branch in Tottenham Court-road in order to get the cheque cashed there, would he not?
As Mr. Kirby told you, they would always cash the cheques, provided that one of the bank's customers asked them to do so; but, considering that our own bank is only in Argyle-street, Regent-street, which is not much more than a mile from our place in Tottenham Court-road, and that we have always been willing to make our cheques open, so that the recipients can get the cash at once, and never has been refused that I am aware of, anyone leaving our place at two o'clock could be there before a quarter-past two, and could get his cheque cashed.

6354. At that time?
At that time.

6355. But the branch in Tottenham Court-road would be of no use to any man who had not a banking account there?
Excepting by getting a friend to ask the bank to cash it.

6356. If a man had no account there, or had not good credit, or if his own account was overdrawn, and it was necessary for him to get cash to pay his workmen with, he would be in considerable difficulty how to deal with a crossed cheque, would he not?
No, because he would simply ask us to make it open.

6357. But then he has to go to your bank?
Yes.

6358. At that time he had an hour to do that in, because the bank closed at three o'clock?
Yes.

6359. Now

6359. Now he has not that hour?
Now he has not.

6360. You say that the man gets his statement before he goes for his cheque?
Yes, always.

6361. Always?
I believe always.

6362. Perhaps Mr. Regnart will speak better on that point?
Mr. Regnart will tell you better.

6363. I think we had evidence in the contrary direction?
But also, I may mention, that Fisher always got Miller's cheques, as you will hear. I do not suppose (this is hearsay evidence) that one in 20 was ever got by Miller himself.

6364. I will ask Mr. Regnart on that point. Would it be possible for a man, finding a certain sum, say 10 per cent. for overcharge taken off on his statement, to suppose that that 10 per cent. had been taken off because he required cash instead of a cheque?
No, impossible.

6365. That could not occur, you think?
It could not occur.

6366. Would you be aware of it personally, if the heads of any of your departments charged anything in the way of a percentage for giving orders?
If I did know of it they would not be in the place five minutes.

6367. But I ask you whether you would know of it?
I never heard of such a thing in my firm.

6368. Would you know if a salesman was charging a percentage?
For giving an order, do you mean?

6369. Yes?
I never heard of such a thing; but if such a thing occurred and I knew it, he would not remain in the place five minutes.

6370. Have never had any complaint of that sort?
Never. The man would be simply dishonest who did such a thing.

6371. Lord *Clinton.*] Is there a statement to that effect in the evidence?
I have not seen any.

6372. *Chairman.*] You have told us that you can produce all Miller's cheques?
I think I can; nearly all.

6373. Can you produce all his invoices?
No, not all the invoices. I think, if you decide to have an inspection, the best thing would be to appoint a sub-committee to see the Bought Ledger.

6374. Do you keep the statements long enough to be able to produce them?
We do not keep them very long. You know it comes to such an enormou packet; but for four or five years back, anything like that, you would be sure to find them; but for the other things you would have to depend on seeing the Bought Ledgers. We have the old Bought Ledgers, right away back perhaps to 1870, but not the invoices, because they are sold as waste paper.

6375. You do not keep them long enough?
No; after a certain time they are sold as waste paper.

6376. I should like clearly to understand about the way you use those labels you handed in to the Committee. I think some were "Manufactured for Maple and Company," and some were "From Maple and Company," and some simply had "Maple and Company" on them?
Yes.

6377. As I understood you then, there was no definite arrangement whereby certain labels were used for different kinds of goods?
Generally speaking, some years since that small label, "Manufactured by Maple & Co.," was very often placed upon furniture that we did not manufacture entirely ourselves; but taking the responsibility of the article, we followed the example of others, and used them in that way.

6378. What is the label you put on goods you do not manufacture on your own premises?
Mr. Regnart would tell you more definitely as to that; but generally speaking the label "Maple and Company, Tottenham Court-road," is on articles not manufactured by us, and also "From Maple and Company, London."

6379. That would be the label that goes on such goods as you do not manufacture at all yourselves?
Yes.

6380. What would be the label on such goods as you manufacture on your own premises?
"Manufactured by Maple and Company" is what we put on now.

6381. That you would place only on goods made on your own premises?
Or at our works in the Islington factory.

6382. How long is it since you have used that label?
We used to use that label previously.

6383. But you say you put that on "now"?
That is the same label that we used to use years ago, and we did put it on to things, as I say, that we did not manufacture ourselves, but which we perhaps finished ourselves and looked over.

6384. Now you confine it entirely to articles manufactured from beginning to end by yourselves?
Under our own auspices.

6385. Since when have you made that change?
I think it was done when the Marks Act was being spoken about, and the question was raised.

6386. Earl of *Onslow.*] Last year?
The beginning of last year, I think it was.

6387. *Chairman.* What do you put on the bought-in goods?
The other labels.

6388. Earl of *Onslow.*] "Manufactured for Maple and Company"?
Mr. Regnart will tell you much better than I can on that. "Manufactured for Maple and Company" is very largely used, but these others (*pointing to some labels*) are used too.

6389. *Chairman.*] I will ask Mr. Regnart about that. Do you think there would be any objection to the maker's name being marked on all the goods?
It would be perfectly impossible.

6390. Why?
In the first place, for instance, in a sideboard there is the glass back and there is the brass work; and in a bedroom suite you get the glass of the wardrobe, the marble top of the wash-hand stand, the tiled backs, and so on.

6391. I did not mean to ask you whether it would be necessary to put the maker's name on all the constituent parts of a sideboard or wardrobe, for instance, but whether the name of the manufacturer who made up the constituent parts into the wardrobe or sideboard could be placed on the articles?
Most decidedly not. The person's name should be placed on the article who is responsible; the same as a watchmaker or a gunmaker, or anyone who is responsible

responsible for the article; otherwise the customer would not understand who Jones was, or Smith, or Robinson.

6392. You think it would be objectionable?
Most objectionable. The manufacturer is no more entitled to put his name upon it than I should be, because he did not produce the thing with his own hands. It ought to be the workman's name if any name other than that of the person responsible is to be put on the thing.

6393. Earl of *Derby*.] I suppose what the customer wants is to have someone to whom he can go with a complaint if he finds the article not such as he desires?
That is so; and that is the only reason that we have for marking the things.

6394. *Chairman*.] You put you name on as a guarantee?
And so as to know also ourselves that if anything goes wrong with the article it was from our place.

6395. And you think it would be objectionable if the manufacturer's name was on it also?
Most decidedly.

6396. I think you have already explained about this webbing (*pointing to some webbing*), and the way in which your name is marked in it?
Yes; that is used in the bottom of chairs and also in mattresses, so that we know the internal parts were sold by us.

6397. I want to ask you a question about this foreign oak?
The carved oak that is mentioned in Elcock's evidence?

6398. His answer to Question 3890 is this: "There is a change in the importation of foreign work, and my complaint is that it is being bought by dealers, and sold to their customers as English oak work, whereas, in my opinion, it ought to be labelled as of foreign manufacture." Then, in answer to the next question, "Have you any proof of that?" he says, "You can go into any shop in Tottenham Court-road, and find that it is sold as carved oak work of English manufacture, unless a direct question is asked; and the majority of customers will not ask any such question." Then he is asked, "Do you mean that it is labelled as English work?" and he says, "No; as regards price it is labelled, but not as regards workmanship, or the country from which it is imported." And his complaint is, in fact, that the foreign oak work is sold as English oak, and he considers that detrimental; in your opinion is that frequently the case?
I should think not; I should think anybody who sold a thing for what it was not was guilty of doing a thing that he ought to be ashamed of. I should dispute that fact altogether; I contend that never to my knowledge has such a thing been done in our establishment; and any of our salesmen who did do such a thing, if it were brought to our knowledge, would be discharged.

6399. Is it easy to distinguish the one from the other?
No, not very.

6400. He says, in answer to Question 3898, "It makes all the difference if the work is not of that substantial character that English carved oak work is supposed to be. For instance, if you try an imported cabinet, the ends are, perhaps, about half-an-inch thick; if you buy an English cabinet they are an inch thick; the one will tumble to pieces in a few years, whereas the other will last for generations;" and so on?
The carved oak furniture that is produced in Belgium principally can be produced quite as good as that manufacturer to whom you are referring ever made.

6401. Do you mean to say that English carved oak is not better than the foreign carved oak?
I will say this, that there is far better English carved oak furniture made in

England than any carved oak furniture can be made abroad, but there is furniture quite as bad made in London as is produced in and comes from Belgium.

6402. But you think it would be a fraud on the customer to describe as English oak what is foreign oak?
Decidedly it would be wrong.

6403. You say it is difficult to distinguish the one from the other?
The workmen can carve exactly the same pattern abroad and here.

6404. Could you, or any large firm buying in goods of this kind, be certain that what you were buying in was of English manufacture, and not foreign manufacture?
Yes, we could be quite certain; but it would not be under the lines that witness refers to, because as a rule the foreign oak furniture is made with thicker sides; thicker and stouter, and more clumsy, than the cabinet work that is produced in England.

6405. As I understand you, you, or any other expert in the trade, would be able to tell whether the goods were of English or of foreign manufacture?
Yes.

6406. But an ordinary person or a customer could not tell?
He would not have the experience.

6407. He could tell by finding that the one came to pieces in a few years and the other did not?
No; I dispute that the one coming from abroad would fall to pieces.

6408. Then how would the customer be able to tell?
An expert would tell simply by the running of the drawers the way that the work is made. It is just like recognising different people's handwriting. You could tell what is produced by a foreigner; I could in furniture; and what is produced by an Englishman; and so would our buyers.

6409. How would the customer know?
The customer would not know. The customers must rely upon the persons from whom they buy.

6410. Then the character of English oak work is also commented upon by Mr. Arnold White, at page 210, in answer to Question No. 2135, where he says, "The effect of giving out this work on a scale of ever-reducing prices is, that the work is scamped. If your Lordships would look at this piece of oak veneer, 44 thicknesses of which go to the inch, you will observe the character of the British oak furniture which is maintaining our name at home and abroad;" and in answer to Question 2138, he says, "That is sold as oak furniture;" and in answer to the next Question, he says that oak furniture "is not understood in the trade as being solid oak." What is the meaning of solid oak in the trade?
"Solid oak," generally speaking, means oak throughout.

6411. The whole of the article made of oak?
That the top would be solid, and the front and nearly the entire thing would be solid; but you know these are technicalities that require to be gone into in regard to veneering; that you may have good veneers, and the furniture made with good solid veneer. For instance, oak veneered on good solid mahogany would be less likely to split than any solid oak; the solid oak might split, whereas a veneer, going the reverse way of the grain, keys the other.

6412. Would you agree that there is a deterioration in, what is called in the trade, solid oak furniture of English manufacture?
No. I believe thoroughly that you can have as good furniture now, if not better, than ever was produced, because you must remember this: it is true that we have some fine specimens of furniture that are handed down to us, but look at the enormous amount of furniture that has vanished altogether from sight;

sight; the common things that were produced have gone, and only the best is left.

6413. Lord *Clinton.*] Is it not difficult to get English oak properly seasoned? That is only done by holding it a long time.

6414. *Chairman.*] Taking the trade in general, you say that there is no deterioration; that this statement about the deterioration that has been spoken of in English solid oak is not correct?

As I explained, you can have, and there are, as good things made now as ever made.

6415. That does not answer my question; I am talking of it in general?

The general tendency of consumption is to the cheaper article. In that way, yes, they are correct in their statement; but then people buy these things who never used to buy them before, because of their cheapness.

6416. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] I suppose English oak is not as useful for a good deal of furniture as foreign oak?

No, you get better oak from abroad; you get it in wider planks.

6417. *Chairman.*] This evidence was given by Mr. Ham at page 375, in answer to Question 3787. "I was going down the Tottenham Court-road (this was not Maple's shop), and in a window I saw an article of furniture labelled as a brown oak sideboard; any mechanic could at once detect that it was not brown oak, only in colour; it had been made brown by an artificial process; not a natural brownness. That was lie number one; underneath it there was another lie, 'our own manufacture'; that shop never employed a mechanic; the sideboard must have been bought in." In your experience of the trade, do you suppose that likely to be true?

Not generally done; such a thing would be impossible to occur in our own establishment.

6418. Do you think it not likely to occur anywhere?

An accident may occur that a wrong ticket may have been placed on.

6419. You think it is not a customary way of deceiving customers?

Decidedly not.

6420. There have been some complaints made, on the subject of designs, by a number of witnesses. I think I might put it fairly by saying that it has been alleged before the Committee that a manufacturer may invent some special design, make the drawings, and make the sample, and then offer it at a certain price, but that other manufacturers have an opportunity of seeing this design and this sample, and are able to make the article or repeat the article at a smaller price, so as to get the order for the whole number of the article that may be required, and that in that way the original designer loses the value of his design and his sample. Would that, in your opinion, be a hardship, if it existed?

The manufacturer always has the power of registering his design; in our own premises, as one of the witnesses has told your Lordships, we try all we can to keep rival manufacturers out of our own show rooms, so that they should not do those things.

6421. I asked you whether you think it would be a hardship if it existed?

I do think that manufacturers copy enormously from each other, and they are able to do it from all the windows at the West End.

6422. And do you think that is a hardship?

In so much that each does it from the other, it becomes equally balanced.

6423. You have done your best, you say, to stop that by not allowing access to your show rooms?

By not allowing access to our show rooms; but still, as I say, in all the shop windows manufacturers have the chance of doing that; very often outside our shop windows you will see manufacturers we know nothing about taking a sketch of an article.

6424. You would not make use of these designs yourselves in order to manufacture articles from them?

No, I do not think we do; we should not take a mean advantage. We have so many designers of our own; we have some of the best designers, I should think, in England, at the present time; and if a Sub-committee of your Lordships would come to our premises you would see all our *employés*, see the designing shops, and see the factories.

6425. Supposing an original pattern sent in for a customer at a certain price, and that this customer approved of it, and required it to be repeated, would you give the offer of repeating it to the original maker of the article?

Most decidedly.

6426. But not if you could get it repeated equally as good at a lower price?

We should not think of getting another manufacturer to do it, if the manufacturer agreed with us as to the value of the article he produced.

6427. Supposing he sent you in an article of the value of 50 *l.*, and somebody wanted half-a-dozen of that article repeated, if you could get it made for 45 *l.*, what would you do; would you tell the original designer that he would have to make it at that price?

Our way would be this: we should see the sideboard (say it is a sideboard) at 50 *l.*; we should then say "This sideboard can be produced, say for 45 *l.*; will you take the order for half-a-dozen at 45 *l.*"; if he said "No, I cannot, you must go elsewhere to get it," we should then ask someone else.

6428. And in that case, if it was an original design and sample which he had sent in, he would lose the benefit of the design and sample?

But, as I have explained to your Lordships already, his sideboard would only be an improvement on that which had been produced before, an alteration of that which had been produced before.

6429. I mean that a second man could make the article cheaper naturally, could he not?

No.

6430. If A. invents a new design, he has to use a certain amount of time and labour in doing so; he then has to have drawings made, and then has to get a sample of it. It appears to me to be obvious that if B. sees that sample he would be able to make it or repeat it at a less price than A., having the benefit of A.'s design, drawings, and sample to work from?

On the price of the first job, yes; but A. would be able to produce four or five equally as cheap as B.

6431. I do not understand that. A. has spent the labour and the time in getting up his design, his drawings, and his sample. It appears obvious that B., if he is given that advantage, can make half-a-dozen or a dozen of them cheaper than A.?

If the sideboard costs 50*l.*, the first one, we may assume that his first cost of designing and getting out the measurements and different things for the sideboard is worth 5*l.*; A. would be able to produce the second and the other ones at 45*l.*; and a new manufacturer, giving him all the advantage that A. has, would only be able to produce it at 45*l.* too.

6432. But does not A. fix his price not upon a single article, but upon the order he is going to get?

No, upon the single article, the article that he made.

6433. Earl of *Onslow.*] But when A. sends it in, does he not expect that he is going to get a large order for those things at the price he sends in?

No.

6434. Do you tell him distinctly he will not?

No; but the man who would bring us a piece of furniture would give a quotation for that piece of furniture.

6435. *Chairman.*]

6435. *Chairman.*] For that alone?
For that alone.

6436. If you said to him, "You will have a dozen to make"?
Then it would be a matter of contract; he would take a contract for a dozen at a fresh price.

6437. Lord *Clinton.*] It would be a fresh arrangement?
Yes.

6438. *Chairman.*] The invoiced price would be on the supposition that he would make a given quantity, would it not?
No. The manufacturer says, "I will make this for 50 *l.*, and if you order a dozen more you shall have them for 45 *l.*," because he can produce them cheaper.

6439. And you think that the original designer and inventor does not in any way lose the fair value of his work and time and trouble by being put into competition with other men who have not had the trouble to get up the design and make the sample?
No, because he gets an extra price on the first article to pay him.

6440. Earl of *Limerick.*] If it was a *bonâ-fide* new design, costing a considerable sum, could he register it?
Yes.

6441. And then no other firm could manufacture that particular sideboard, or whatever it might be?
That is so; and that is done.

6442. Lord *Thring.*] What is the expense of registration?
I think it is 10 *s.*

6443. And what is the time it takes?
It is only to go to Somerset House.

6444. *Chairman.*] Of course you insist upon it that the article, if it is repeated, should be the same?
If you order a thing to be made the same it should be.

6445. In all upholstery work and cabinet-maker work is it the part of an expert to tell precisely the value of the material and workmanship without taking it to pieces?
I should think we are able to judge it thoroughly.

6446. I mean if A. says, "This is a thing I cannot do for less than 50 *l.*," and the other man says, "I will do it for 40 *l.*," you could be perfectly certain when B.'s work came in that it was as good in all respects as A.'s?
Yes.

6447. Without taking the thing to pieces, you can tell that?
If it was necessary to take the back off a chest of drawers you would see the whole thing; and that is done in a minute.

6448. Is the material used now as good or better than say 15 years ago?
Quite as good.

6449. It is not the custom in the trade, is it, to have written contracts?
No; if you like I will explain why.

6450. You did explain that as far as you are concerned, you gave written orders if they were required?
Decidedly, if asked for them.

6451. But at the same time, I think you mentioned that it would cause inconvenience; so I presume if that be so, I should be correct in saying that a manufacturer insisting upon a written contract would be at a certain disadvantage?
No, not at all.

6452. Do you mean that a man who did not give so much trouble would not be preferred?
No. Generally speaking the buyer would say, "If you go round to the office the clerk will write you out the order and I will come round there and initial it."

6453. And you think that extra trouble would not be against the man?
Not the slightest.

6454. That a man always insisting upon a written order would not get any less work than if he were content with a verbal order?
Not the slightest.

6455. How is the transaction noted when a man accepts an order verbally; is it in a book?
There is an order book; there is a piece at the side, and it is perforated, so that what is entered there is entered on the side as well.

6456. What kind of entry is made if a man takes an order to make you half-a-dozen bedroom suites?
"Six bedroom suites," and whatever the name of the pattern is, entered at such-and-such a price.

6457. So that the verbal contract is entered in writing in your book?
In our books.

6458. If a man had any misunderstanding as to the nature of these verbal orders, he could refer to these order books?
Decidedly.

6459. And see exactly what took place as to price, and so on?
Yes.

6460. So that no misunderstanding is likely to arise?
No. But with all the thousands of transactions we have, I may say that the courts of law themselves speak and show that we never have a dispute, never such a thing occurs.

6461. I see I asked Mr. Elcock at Question 3927, page 387, "Is it your custom to take orders without a written agreement?" And he says: "It was with Messrs. Maple, and I have never known them to give a written order myself, except in one case. The first think I ever did for them, I asked Mr. Maple to give me a written order, and he asked me the question if I did not think the firm of Maple was sound enough or good enough." That you would say is incorrect?
I should say it would be, but I cannot speak for my father as to what happened 15 years since. I am sure he would not remember.

6462. That would not in your opinion represent the general way in which the business is conducted?
It does not.

6463. I would like to ask you now a question or two as to the way in which wages and prices are fixed; I think you have a piece-workshop and a time-workshop, have you not; a shop working by piece-work, and one by time?
There are so many different departments; if you are referring to the stuffing department——

6464. I will take that, if you like?
You had better ask Mr. Imlay as to all the details of the working of that.

6465. You mentioned that your firm made loans to manufacturers working for them?
Not as a rule.

6466. To put up machinery?
We have lent manufacturers money to build factories, and to put up machinery;

machinery; but if we do so we should not charge them more than 5 per cent. per annum.

6467. I was not going to ask you that question, but whether it is the case that you do make these loans?
We have done so.

6468. Is it customary?
Not general; but we have assisted manufacturers at different times.

6469. In the one particular case that was mentioned, I think it was Mr. Miller who said that Mr. Regnart advanced him money for a certain purpose; do you know whether that was done, if it were done at all in the name of the firm, or whether it would be a private transaction with Mr. Regnart?
Mr. Regnart informs me that he never did that; but I can say that the firm never did it to Miller, and his partner Wicks informs me that that money to which he refers was lent him by his own father.

6470. On what terms do you tend these loans to manufacturers?
They are not regular loans. Supposing that a manufacturer is working for us, we might advance him, as any other capitalist might advance a manufacturer, lending him a few thousand pounds if he wanted it.

6471. I asked you on what terms you lend to manufacturers?
Not more than 5 per cent. per annum, I should think, never; hardly that sometimes.

6472. Would that go off his *per contra* account?
No.

6473. That would be a separate thing altogether?
Yes.

6474. It would not show in your books in his *per contra* account?
No.

6475. What does his *per contra* account consist of?
Things he has bought.

6476. For his own use, or for the purpose of manufacturing?
Anything that he might buy would be in the *per contra* account.

6477. Earl of *Derby.*] Anything you did in that way you would consider done by yourself as a private individual, I suppose, and not by the firm in the ordinary course of business?
Yes, for the sake of assisting a man?

6478. *Chairman.*] I understood that to be done by the firm?
It would be done by the firm in some cases, by my father or myself singly.

6479. I was asking you the question on the supposition that it was done by the firm?
But the cases would be so small in number, they would not average two a year, if they are anything like that.

6480. You said in your evidence, I forget the exact words, but they were to this effect: "We lend money or make loans to manufacturers, to assist them in putting up machinery"?
We have done so.

6481. That would be on the part of the firm?
It may in some cases have been by the firm, sometimes by my father, sometimes by myself.

6482. But the interest on the loan would not show in the man's account?
Not at all.

6483. Supposing he ceased to manufacture for you, would you demand the principal?

No, I do not see that these questions are relevant at all; I would rather not answer such questions as those, because some people would get the idea that we are money lenders.

6484. I was referring to the information you gave before the Committee, to the effect that you have loaned money to manufacturers for the purpose of putting up machinery?
We have done so.

6485. I asked you whether it was customary, or whether it was done on the part of the firm?
We have done so.

6486. You were good enough to say that you would give the number of persons in your employment under the age of 21?
I have the information here. Boys (under 21 years of age), porters 14, carmen 21, cabinet makers 2, polishers 22, mattress makers 10, gliders 3, stuffing departments 39, decorating 15, joiners 9, upholsterers 10, carpet planners 8; making a total of 153 out of the 1,295, I think it was.

6487. One hundred and fifty-three under 21 years of age?
Under 21 years of age.

6488. Lord *Monkswell.*] That is including the 69?
That is including the 69; there are 69 under 18 years of age, and consequently there would be 84 between 18 and 21 out of the total of 1,295, I think it is.

6489. Lord *Thring.*] How do you pay your own workmen; in cheques or in money?
Always in money.

6490. And why do you not give open cheques as a rule instead of giving them as the exception?
Because our cheques are printed across, and I should think that in proportion there would be 95 per cent. of the recipients of our cheques who would have banking accounts.

6491. But why do you not reverse the rule and give open cheques unless you are asked to cross cheques; a man can cross them himself?
Is it not better to cater for the 95 per cent. than to cater for the 5 per cent.?

6492. But if you give me a cheque, I can cross it upon my own bankers?
Yes, but when they are sent by post, it is always safest to cross the cheques.

6493. But I understand that these cheques that we have heard so much of are not sent by post, but the man comes for them himself?
In some cases they do; but if they were to lose the cheques it would be their loss if it were not crossed.

6494. That is their affair, not yours?
But considering that every cheque can be made open, if a man wants it open, before he leaves the premises, surely it is much better to have it kept safe for his protection by crossing it. If I were to ask our manufacturers whether they would prefer the cheques to be crossed or open, I am convinced that 99 out of every 100 would prefer them to be crossed.

6495. We have been told that they would prefer open cheques; I cannot see why you should not give them open cheques?
I should be willing to do that if I were asked for them.

6496. With respect to these transactions, am I right in understanding this: Supposing you want one of these chairs made; I understand you say to a man, "Make me that chair," and that he knows, from the custom of your house, what will be paid for that chair, without any contract at all?
We should arrange a price.

6497. You

6497. You arrange a price?
Decidedly.

6498. Verbally?
Verbally, or by written order.

6499. And you say, "Just give me some price"?
Say that it is 3 *l.* 10 *s.*

6500. Then when the man comes, he puts in his invoice 3 *l.* 10 *s.*; then your agent says to him, "That chair is badly made; I will deduct 10*s.* from that price," and you do not say to him, "We will consult some other man," but "We will deduct 10 *s.*" at once, do you not?
No; it would be a matter of arrangement. The buyer, that is to say, the manager of our department, would say, "That chair is not good value; I do not think that you ought to have 3 *l.* 10 *s.* for it."

6501. But "You only ought to have 3 *l.*"?
Yes.

6502. Then the word of your buyer is conclusive upon the matter?
No; if the man says, "It is made to order, I got the order for 3 *l.* 10 *s.*," the 3 *l.* 10 *s.* would be paid.

6503. But in order to do that he would have to bring an action against you?
No; if there was a complaint against one of our buyers, they would refer it to my father or myself, who are on the premises.

6504. And you or your father would be the judge whether the claim was just or not?
Decidedly; and considering that for these last 27 years I do not remember four actions brought against us in all our commercial undertakings numbering hundreds of thousands, that fact, I think, speaks for itself.

6505. Earl of *Onslow*.] Is it your practice to advance money to manufacturers to establish themselves in business to work for you?
No.

6506. Mr. Richards, I think, has said that you did advance money to him?
We lent money to him. He was building, and he wanted to lay down some machinery, and he was lent some money to put down machinery; and he is one of the cases that I had in my mind when I said that we had lent the money to put down machinery.

6507. Is he an exceptional case?
Yes, there are very few of them.

6508. And do you bind down those to whom you advance money for such purposes to work for you, and for you only?
No; the whole of Richards' business done with our firm, as you will see, amounts in about six or seven years to 21,000 *l.* Now during that time there is no doubt in my mind that he manufactured something like about 400,000 *l.* Therefore, we only took about five per cent. of the goods that he produced in the time.

6509. How do you secure yourselves when you advance money in that way?
In the same way that any of your Lordships might secure himself.

6510. By a mortgage?
By a mortgage.

6511. Now I understand that several of the witnesses said that they made complaints to Mr. Regnart, and that they found it impossible to get at the heads of the firm, and I think in the letter you wrote to Mr. Waltham (which appears in your answer to Question 5893) you said, "As I have at all times explained, and as events have proved, whenever, or should ever, any misunderstandings arise, it has been, and will be, my anxious endeavour to investigate the

the matters." I want to know whether in practice you, or one of your senior partners are always accessible to your employés?

Always.

6512. You have ever heard any complaints from your employés that they have been unable to have an interview with you upon any points of misunderstanding or difference?

None at all. As I say, my father is in business from half-past ten every morning until half-past six, and I should say is there fully 250 days out of the 300, and I am, generally speaking, there when he is not there, and we are always visible, and always will take up any subject of dispute.

6513. We shall probably get it better from Mr. Regnart when he is called. But if Mr. Regnart said to an employé that Mr. Maple would not see him, that it was no use going to Mr. Maple, that would not be in accordance with your wish?

No, not at all.

6514. Then with regard to the supply of materials for orders, it is, I understand, entirely optional with the men whether they take the materials from you or not?

Quite so.

6515. Does it make any difference in the price you pay them for their labour whether they buy the materials of you or buy them elsewhere?

Not the slightest.

6516. Have you increased the practice of supplying materials to your workmen?

Our workmen have bought very much more largely lately from us than heretofore.

6517. But is that at your desire, or of their own accord?

Of their own free will.

6518. One of the witnesses, Mr. Parnell, said at Question 2863, that since Christmas last year you have very considerably extended your own manufacturing workshop, is that so?

Yes, and we are still further increasing our workshops.

6519. And may I ask what the reason for that is?

Because we are going in more for the gilding and mirrors, plate-glass work, than we did before; and although we already have a large lot of machinery and very large premises, yet we are going to throw in now some 50 houses more into our premises.

6520. But it is not for the cabinet-making part of your trade, is it?

Yes, it is in connection with cabinet-making, the cabinets with glasses and carved work; and we are still developing the manufacture of more cabinet work.

6521. Will that diminish the amount of ready-made goods that you will buy from outside?

I anticipate not; I anticipate that seeing how fast our business is increasing, we shall then not be in any greater proportion in regard to what we produce over what we buy than at the present time.

6522. Passing to another subject, Mr. Baum said that he had worked for you for three and a-half years in your workshop, and during the whole of that time he never saw the factory inspector; do you know at all how often the factory inspector visits your premises?

Personally I cannot say, but I have no doubt in his usual course of duties.

6523. Have you ever seen him?

I used to see Mr. Redgrave at different times, but with regard to the present inspector I do not know how it is; but then I am not so continually there as I used to be a few years since.

6524. I suppose Mr. Baum worked in a branch of your manufacturing work?

In the stuffing department.

6525. Is

6525. Is that one to which the Factory Act would apply?
Yes.

6526. With regard to the reduction of prices previously agreed upon, we were told that the practice in the trade was that certain goods were known to be worth a certain sum; that it was an understood contract, an implied contract, but that if a man brought goods to pattern he might have an arbitrary deduction made from his invoice; is that the practice?
There is no such thing as arbitrary deductions; it is always a question of arrangement

6527. First of all, is it a fact that it is well known that goods made to pattern will be paid at the same price as the last goods made of the same kind?
No, it is not, because prices are continually changing; and we should not have to pay the same price in a good many instances as the old West-end houses.

6528. Supposing that for 12 months past you had given 30*s.* for every chair of that kind (*pointing to a chair*) that was invoiced to you, is there any implied contract that you will give 30*s.* for the next one that is made?
None at all. If it was ordered from the man to bring in 12 of those chairs at 30*s.* as before, we should pay that; but if he brought 12 of those chairs to us, without being ordered, and we did not require the chairs, and the chair could be produced cheaper than they were when we had them before, he would be told, "We can take them at 28*s.* if you like, or you can take them away"; it is a matter of contract.

6529. Then you deny that there is any practise in the trade of always paying the same price for the same article?
Most decidedly I deny that.

6530. Supposing a man invoices a chair to you, and you know that you can get that chair made elsewhere for less, do you deduct, as an overcharge, the balance between the invoiced price and the price you think you could get it made for by somebody else?
No; if we were to order anything to be made at a certain price, we should pay it whatever it was.

6531. No, I am not asking that question; I am asking about an invoiced price without a contract?
The man would have no business to bring us the article if it was not ordered.

6532. Then with reference to the designs. Do you deny that you have ever asked Mr. Elcock, or any other person, to come into your warehouse and to see another man's pattern, and say how much less he can do that for than the man who sent the pattern in?
Personally, I have not done so; but then such things as this are quite possible; for instance, in the case of Mr. Elcock, with regard to that particular sideboard that he brought the action for, for 28 *l.*, another manufacturer came forward at the trial, Mr. Marchant, and said that he could produce that same sideboard for 20 *l.*; therefore, there is a case.

6533. Had I better ask Mr. Regnart upon that point, as to whether Mr. Elcock was ever called in to copy a pattern sent in by another man?
You may ask him decidedly, but I expect his will be the same answer as I give you.

6534. *Chairman.*] Is Mr. Regnart practically responsible for the put-out work?
He is responsible for some portion of it; the bed-room furniture in particular is what he has to do with.

6535. Earl of *Onslow.*] Now, with regard to your system of payment for work; the Committee were given to understand that the men were engaged at so much an hour?
Yes.

6536. But that if, when their work was completed, it was of less value than the agreed rate per hour which they had taken to make it, they were paid in accordance with the value that you set upon the article, and not in accordance with the time that they had taken to make it; is that so?

Generally that is not so, but Mr. Imlay will reply to you as to what appertains to piece-work as regards upholstery; he will explain to you the lines that other firms use, and what did occur at the time that your witness refers to in the stuffing department, that so much work was expected, but when the man did more work he had leisure in exchange.

6537. Is Mr. Imlay an employé of yours?

Yes; he is the foreman of our stuffers; he is coming before you.

6538. Then I will ask him. Do you encourage or discourage the giving of written orders?

We do not do one thing or the other.

6539. If any one asks for a written order you are prepared to give it?

They always have it then.

6540. Is there any objection to giving a written order for every order over a certain sum, say 2 *l.*?

Not the slightest.

6541. If any of your workmen asked you for one to-morrow, you would be willing to give it?

Decidedly; in all the departments there are clerks there to write them out.

6542. I understand you to say, that the effect of the system of cheap manufacture has been considerably to reduce the cost of production of furniture; but has it at the same time had any effect upon the skilled labour employed in the West-end shops, in what I think you called the old jobbing firms?

No, nor in ours; the workmen get the same wages as heretofore.

6543. We were told by Mr. Arnold White that all the large West-end firms are reducing the number of their employés on account of the spread of the sub-contracting system; do you think that the sub-contracting system is having the effect of reducing the number of skilled labourers employed?

Not the number of skilled labourers employed, but the number in those particular firms, because those particular firms buy more than they used to, from people who employ the same labour that they would employ themselves.

6544. I understood you to say, that that showed that these firms were able to do as much work with fewer hands; did you mean upon their own premises?

In some cases by the aid of machinery.

6545. And in other cases by reason of their putting the work out to be sub-contracted?

Decidedly.

6546. Mr. Shaughnessy, in answer to Questions 4539 and 4540, told us that when he was employed on your premises in 1880, there were 50 men working with him, but that in 1887 there were only 10 with him, and that the places of the 40 had been taken by boys and improvers; is that the case?

You can have a definite answer from Mr. Imlay on that, but I say that the statement is most incorrect.

6547. That question too you would wish asked of Mr. Imlay?

Yes; but you have also the pay-sheets themselves, which show the number of men.

6548. Then in the case where you give a man a chair to finish which has been stuffed by boys, or improvers' labour, do you make that man responsible for the whole of the article he has to finish, including the work done by the boys and improvers?

No, I should think not; but Mr. Imlay is the man that would be placed in conversation with the workmen, and not myself.

6549. You

6549. You told the Committee that one of the great advantages that you claim for your system of doing business was, that you gave the boys what I believe everybody admits is very much required by the working classes, a technical education, and you said that you promoted them by gradations; I want to know what you mean by promoting them by gradations?

They get from one class of work to another. For instance, when a boy first comes, he has naturally to assist the men taking the things backwards and forwards; then he commences to web a chair; then another stage would be when he is able to lace in the springs, and so he works on. But Mr. Imlay can reply to you more fully as to the different stages.

6550. What can a boy finally rise to; can he rise to turning out a complete chair?

Yes, decidedly; the rise of these boys is such that, as Mr. Imlay will tell you, men who come to us as apprentices are now getting the highest wage in our place.

6551. You say they can "rise" through their exertions to any position in the commercial world"?

Yes.

6552. It is not only in the stuffing or covering business, but "to any position in the commercial world"?

They would start in the business and learn to be stuffers, and then they would naturally apply themselves, and they might become master men in that way.

6553. Then there is nothing in your system of apprenticeship which prevents a man from becoming a complete upholsterer?

Nothing. I do not mean the old-fashioned upholsterer, when in the old-fashioned upholsterer was included mattrass making, loose-case cutting, blind cutting, and all those other branches of the upholstery department which used to be the old-fashioned upholstery department. As Mr. Baum says, it is cut up now; a young fellow who is taught the upholstery of the chair, the couch, the easy chair, and all those stuffing things, is not taught to make mattresses, and he is not taught to cut loose cases.

6554. What do you mean, then, by saying that he can rise to any position in the commercial world?

So he can; he can rise to be a stuffer; from being a stuffer he becomes a master-man and supplies the trade.

6555. But would he become a sufficiently experienced workman to be able to employ men under him to do all those branches of the trade of which he has not himself a personal knowledge?

He could.

6556. I understood you to say that you employed 69 boys only under the age of 18 years?

Yes.

6557. Of those a certain number are employed in the carmen's department, the porters' department, the shipping department, and the carpet planners' department; 35, I think, altogether; would any of those employed in those departments be able to rise in the commercial world as you suggest; what are they learning?

The porters, I suppose, are porters in the different places. For instance, a boy in the carpet-planning department learns to measure rooms, and then to cut out carpets to fit the rooms, and to lay them down. For instance, one of our carpet boys I know at the present time has a West End shop in Kensington, who came to us as a boy in the carpet-planning department, and he is doing a very good business indeed.

6558. There are only two boys as carpet planners, I think; what technical education are those in the shipping department, and the porters receiving?
Such education as will get them their living hereafter, naturally.

6559. Then of the others, I suppose you would say that all those employed in the cabinet-making, the polishers, the mattrass-making, the gilders, the plumbers, and the decorators, are acquiring a technical knowledge of their trades?
Yes.

6560. A knowledge of a more technical character than that which boys in the carmen's, the porters, and the shipping departments are getting?
Yes, they become a higher class mechanic, you may say.

6561. Then you said, in answer to Question 5920, "The complaint is made that the boy labour, this system of sweating introduced through boy labour, is a new thing, but it is no such thing; the boys have always been apprenticed and taught their trade, and the boys are now being taught in the same way as before." I want to know how you can reconcile that with the statement that you have inaugurated what I understood to be a new system of teaching these boys a technical education, which they would not have been in a position to receive had it not been for your system?
Apprentices have always been taken by different firms and apprenticed, and that is what we are doing now. I cannot speak of 30 or 40 years ago. I am not sure which of the trade secretaries it was who said that it used to be customary to pay 100 *l.* to apprentice a boy.

6562. And now you charge nothing?
And now we charge nothing; and if the boys are sharp boys with a certain amount of education, such as is sufficient for us to take them, we commence at at once to pay them, instead of taking a large fee.

6563. Then the difference between the old system and the new system is that under the old system they were taught what you call jobbing work, to hang curtains, and do everything of that kind, and that now you teach them thoroughly one branch of their trade which will enable them to "rise to any position in the commercial world"?
Yes; those who are in the upholstery department, for instance, are employed there and become upholsterers; all of that department.

6564. Does the apprenticing of these boys have the effect of increasing the amount of labour in the labour market?
I cannot say; boys must be employed, I suppose, everywhere.

6565. And when they are taught, there will be more men with a technical education than there would be if they were not taught?
Decidedly.

6566. And therefore there is a greater competition in the labour market?
If out of 20 men 10 are doing nothing, and then you cause by your education 15 to get work, there is decidedly more competition, because there are the 15 instead of the 10.

6567. When you were asked to define sweating, you said, in answer to Question 6164, that you considered it "always a question of supply and demand;" and you went on to say, "No customer is going to pay more for an article than he can buy it for elsewhere if he knows it, and a manufacturer is not going to sell you a thing for 2 *l.* if he can sell it to somebody else and get 3 *l.*" Is not that competition a competition which has developed of recent years?
I should think it always existed.

6568. But has it not developed increasingly in recent years owing to the demand of the public for cheap furniture, and the desire on the part of the manufacturer to supply it?

I think

I think myself that the purchasers have a greater knowledge of the value of articles now than they ever had before, and they are more careful to buy in the cheapest markets, and that is why firms like ours increase to such an extent.

6569. With regard to those manufacturers who work for you outside, do you ever refuse work to them when employment could be given in order to get your goods at a cheaper rate by accumulating your orders?
No.

6570. That is utterly untrue?
Utterly untrue.

6571. You said that when Mr. Arnold White was advertising for evidence upon this subject you offered him every facility for inquiring into your business?
I did.

6572. May I ask you what you expected him to do?
I expected him to come to Tottenham Court-road, to have conversations with any of our employés, and to go through the workshops to see how everything was produced; and I offered that he might inspect any of our books.

6573. You said that you had a very slight acquaintance with the sweating system such as exists in the East-end; may I ask whether you yourself, or any of your firm, make inquiries into the conditions under which goods are manufactured which you buy ready made?
Mr. Regnart or any of our buyers would be visiting no doubt all the factories, I should say, from whence we buy our goods. I might say that they would speak more thoroughly to that.

6574. Do you think that those who are your subordinates in the firm are acquainted with the conditions under which the goods are produced?
Yes, I do.

6575. Now do you make any of the lower cheaper class of furniture which is used by the working men?
No, we do not; and we sell in fact very little of the lowest class.

6576. But you probably have an acquaintance with the relative prices now and in former years in that class of furniture?
Yes.

6577. Can you say whether it has considerably fallen in price?
Considerably fallen, enormously fallen; as Mr. Regnart will tell you, the price of wood has fallen enormously, and in fact the price of everything.

6578. Then Mr. Jelliffe, at No. 3225, told the Committee that the large drapers, whom he described, and the dealers who have entered the trade, "many of them never employ any man at all, but simply by buying work in, undersell what we call the best firms in the West-end of London, although they supply a much superior article to the customers." Now I suppose when he says that these large profits are made by the dealers, he should take into consideration the rent, the knowledge which the heads of a large firm like yours must acquire, the expenses on advertisement, and the loss on stock remaining on hand for some time?
And the re-polishing and the interest of the capital, and the bad debts that you may make in your trading, and your delivery.

6579. To arrive at a fair estimate, all those things ought to be taken into consideration?
Yes.

6580. Then we are told that since 1811 as to which time the same witness, Mr. Jeliffe, put in a book of prices, there has been a considerable fall in the price of furniture?
Yes.

6581. And he told us that a pembroke table which could be made at 5 *s.* 4½ *d.* for the labour was now made for 3 *s.*; 44 per cent. difference, and that a man working hard could make two such tables in a day and earn 6 *s.*, have you considered at all what has been the fall in the price of commodities that the working man has to buy during the same time?

I have not thoroughly considered the question; but as I say, this witness perhaps does not take into consideration in quoting those prices that some of the work has been done by machinery; and then there is no doubt that commodities have all gone down in price; but the best class of cabinet labour is earning as much, take the year all through, now as it used to do.

6582. But it is a well-known fact, is it not, that all the articles of diet, and articles of clothing purchased by the working man have fallen very largely in value?

They have fallen very largely in value.

6583. And that the quantities used for home consumption have increased very largely in amount, and that therefore one may reasonably suppose that the workman is in a position to buy very much more largely than he was 50 years ago?

He will get a great deal more for the money.

6584. And that wages generally have not fallen, but rather have risen, I am speaking of wages in all the trades analagous to that of the cabinet making trade, such as carpenters, bricklayers, masons, &c.?

But then I think you must take into consideration that the working men have improved also; I think that they are better able to do their work than they were; I think they are more proficient.

6585. Would you say that, notwithstanding the fall in the prices paid for ready made articles in the cabinet making trade, the position of the labourer now, as compared with that of the labourer 50 years ago, is decidedly better?

I should think decidedly better, but still I am speaking personally from a knowledge of the present state of things which I have not of 50 years ago.

6586. Then we were told that a long time ago in 1811, there was a list of prices in the trade which was accepted by all the masters and the men; why was that discontinued?

I cannot tell you.

6587. What objections have you to such a list of prices being adopted?

My reply would take a long time; but I may say that I think if it is useful to the trade, the trade would adopt such a suggestion.

6588. Do you deny that in 1880 you deducted 15 per cent. besides the usual 2½ for paying Mr. Miller in cash?

I do, most decidedly.

6589. And do you deny having taken 2 *l.* 10 *s.* interest for a loan of 100 *l.* for three weeks?

Most decidedly; it is a deliberate lie.

6590. Earl of *Derby.*] I understand you absolutely to deny having made any deductions from payments to people employed by you, except for a definite reason, such as that the work was defective and required to be altered?

Quite so.

6591. And I understand you also to absolutely to deny that there had been to your knowledge any case of discounting cheques or paying less than their full amount?

It is impossible that it could have occurred, and it never has occurred to my certain knowledge.

6592. Now, you were asked whether there was an understanding that the same price should always be paid for the same article; I suppose the price for the article when sold by you varies from time to time?

It does.

6593. Therefore

6593. Therefore you would necessarily vary the price which you paid to the person who made it?
Yes, quite so.

6594. I think I understood you to say that you are now in the practice of making more and buying less from outside than formerly?
No, we are making more, but as our business increases we still continue to buy as much.

6595. It is an addition to your former business, not a substitution of one for the other.
Not a substitution.

6596. Speaking generally, do you think that the practice of buying goods from outside, and not directly employing workmen to make them, is increasing or diminishing?
I should think that it is rather increasing than diminishing.

6597. Can you give any reason for that?
Simply that by the greater production of the same sort of article you can cheapen the cost. For instance, men being always employed making chests of drawers, and the drawers being cut out to a certain size in large quantities, the ends all being cut out together in large quantities, they can be put together cheaper than in making them singly.

6598. That is the old story of greater cheapness arising from division of labour?
Yes.

6599. Each one learns to do fewer things, but he learns to do those few things better.
Yes.

6600. That is not exactly the question I meant to ask you. Are you more or less than formerly in the habit of buying articles brought to you from people with whom you have no other connection than that of purchasing occasionally from them?
We now very seldom, if ever, buy from new people; they are, generally speaking, firms that have been working for us for years; casual purchases from newspeople is what used to be called in the trade buying on the hawk; that was the term years ago.

6601. But you have nothing to do with those firms or with their relations with the men whom they employ?
No.

6602. You are merely customers, though habitual customers?
That is all.

6603. Has the growth of that practice of manufacture by small firms who sell again to larger firms, do you think, had its origin in disputes which have arisen between employers and employed?
I think it has tended that way in certain cases. When shops have had disagreements with the society men, they have then gone and bought, and so it has tended to get firms to buy instead of being troubled with the workmen themselves.

6604. They avoid all the unpleasantnesses of disputes in that way?
Yes.

6605. And I presume we may take it that the smaller man is less liable to difficulties of that kind, because he is more nearly on a level with the man he employs?
Yes.

6606. He understands their ways?
Yes, and he can pal, *i.e.* be sociable with them better.

6607. Earl of *Limerick.*] As regards that hotel competition which I think Mr. Richards mentioned in his evidence, did Mr. Richards cease dealing with you after that competition?

Oh no; Mr. Richards complains of that occurring; but if you turn to his reply to Question 4557, you will see that he said this: "In May 1877, Mr. Regnart sent for me and told me there was a very large job going that required 300 or 400 bed-room suites." Now Mr. Richards never complained to me nor I believe to anyone else, as to the way in which he was treated in respect to this order, and he continued doing business with us until August 1879, nearly two years and a half after that date. Again, his statement as to 300 or 400 bed-room suites being required is perfectly untrue. The greatest number of suites in one pattern and in one wood was 24.

6608. Did he deal with you for any fresh business after that, or for orders already entered into.

Mr. Richards dealt with us after this, May 1877, until August 1879, and never said one word of complaint as to the treatment that he received in respect of that furniture.

6609. Did he deal with you largely?

Yes, he continued to deal with us largely; but as I said before, the total figures are here before me. During the eight years that we had business with him the whole amount came to 21,615 *l.* 6 *s.* 1 *d.*, and I have no hesitation in saying that Mr. Richards during that time must have supplied altogether to people over 300,000 *l.* worth of work besides the 21,000 *l.* that he supplied to us; and therefore it is a most extraordinary thing that Mr. Richards should lay to our charge that he lost his money by doing this small amount of business with us, small in proportion to his general returns.

6610. I wish to call your attention to a letter which appeared in the "Star" newspaper, dated the 27th of June, and purporting to be written by Mr. W. F. Dickson, which is to the following effect: "I notice in this morning's papers that Mr. Maple denies the accuracy of my evidence, given before the Commission on the Sweating System. Will you allow me, in contradiction of his statement that his firm have not done business with me, but have had eight transactions only with my father, to say that my father has been dead nearly 15 years, and that Mr. Maple's firm have had 51 transactions with me. Yours, &c., W. F. Dickson." That is a contradiction of your statement; is there anything that you can say upon it?

Yes: his letter seems to be a most extraordinary letter, for if you look at his reply to Question 4395, he says there: "Thirteen years ago Messrs. Maple threw upon my hands goods for which they had given me orders to the extent of 420 *l.*, the sole reason for their doing so being our refusal to take from the agreed price 2 *l.* 2 *s.* 6 *d.* from one table, and one sovereign from the agreed price of a wardrobe, being altogether 3 *l.* 2 *s.* 6 *d.*; because we refused to take that off, Mr. Regnart, the gentleman who still has the management of the department, said, 'I will not take any of your orders,' and he did not take it, and we have done nothing for them since." Then further on, in reply to Lord Clinton, who asked at No. 4415, "What is the date of this?" he says: "The 23rd September 1874. That is a long time ago, but it is still the same gentleman who is the manager of that department." Therefore what I stated is perfectly correct. Mr. Regnart denies this transaction, as he will tell you, of having ordered any goods which he refused to take from this man; and as I said before in my evidence, our business had all been done with the father and not with the son. He refers in his letter to 51 transactions. I made this mistake, that I said eight transactions, but I should have said seven; that is to say, that there were seven payments, to him. It is perfectly true that there were 51 invoices for those payments because the payments were not made every time that the goods were brought in. So that in my statement that I made to your Committee I was perfectly correct in what I said to you.

6611. There is his statement, that it was with his father and not with himself.

Not

Not with himself, and he says there that we have done nothing with him since; and that was in 1874, previous to the death of his father.

6612. And have you had no transactions with him since his father's death?
Nothing to my knowledge, and he himself says they have had nothing with him, answer 4395.

6613. I did not quite understand the statement about the payments; you say that there were seven payments for 51 different transactions?
Seven payments for 51 different invoices.

6614. Lord *Sandhurst.*] One or two witnesses have given some evidence about what they termed "dropping time"; would you rather speak to that or leave it to someone else?
No, Mr. Imlay will speak to that; it appertains to an arrangement that existed in the stuffing department, his department, and he would explain it to you thoroughly.

6615. Then you said, I think this morning, that you very often, or almost invariably furnished materials to these people that you employ, wood and so on; and the witness Miller, at Question 2375, is asked in regard to this. The question by the Chairman is this: "You said that Messrs. Maple supplied their own materials for you to work with?—(*A.*) They have of late years. (*Q.*) With the exception of glass?—(*A.*) No, glass and all; everything. (*Q.*) And you think that you can get as good materials cheaper yourself?—(*A.*) Yes; goods that they invoice to me at 8 *d.* a foot, for instance, I could have gone and bought at 6 *d.* (*Q.*) Timber?—(*A.*) Yes, timber." Do you deny that?
I deny it; and I adduce in refutation of it the whole of our business transactions with Mr. Miller and with his partner; and his partner, Mr. Wicks, and Mr. Fisher, his managing clerk, will also further deny that fact.

6616. Then I think you also employ a firm at Islington?
We do.

6617. Do you know what prices are paid by them; do they make everything on their premises?
Everything, I believe.

6618. Then the witness, Waltham, at Question 4438, was asked by the Chairman this question: "You say that in your experience Maple's is a sweating firm; what do you mean by that?" and his answer was: "I mean that they not only do not pay the legitimate trade wage to the workman; but they use him worse, and endeavour, when he is working for them, to reduce the wage by some side means; for instance, one man made a statement to me that he was employed at 45 *s.* a week."
That is all hearsay, you notice.

6619. Quite so. But then he goes on to say, "I take it that a firm is a sweating firm that pretends to pay a man what they do not." Then he is asked: "What do you mean by that?" and his reply is, "If a firm pretends to pay a man $10\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* an hour for his work, and only pays him $10\frac{1}{8}$ *d.* per hour, and will not pay him for odd quarters and half-hours, and expects him to produce a certain amount of work in the course of an hour, which at their own valuation is far more than the man's wage; if a man receives 45 *s.* for a week's work, and he has to produce work which is valued at 57 *s.* or 58 *s.* for it, he is sweated." Have you got anything to say about that?
I do not believe that that occurs in our firm at all.

6620. You do not believe that such a case as that is possible in your firm?
No. You see the next question is, "But is that peculiar to Maple and Company?" and his answer is, "That is peculiar to that firm." So the question is one which perhaps you will kindly ask Mr. Imlay to answer; I am not aware of it.

6621. As far as your knowledge goes, you absolutely deny it?
Yes.

6622. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Do you more frequently buy for stock than for individual orders?
Much more; I should say that 99 per cent. of what we buy is for stock.

6623. Would such a case as this be possible, that a man had been making articles, wardrobes, or any things to a certain order, and then you would say; "Well, if you would like to go on during the slack time making these things to order, you may go on, but we shall of course give you so much per cent. less"?
Mentioning him a lower price, you mean? Yes, we should; that is common.

6624. Then Mr. Baum, in answer to Question 3074, says: "There are (I do not say deliberate) evasions of the Factory Act, but breaches of the Factory Act do occur there; they do occur from time to time. One was brought under my notice only a fortnight ago of the work-girls having to take work home after the day's work was done, having got something like seven-and-a-half hours to do when they got home, and after they had done their labour in the factory;" do you think that that would be possible in your establishment?
I will not say that it has never occurred, that there may not have been a case; but it is not necessary because there is a clause in the Factory Act which gives the power to houses like ours to work for 90 days' overtime in the year so as to cater for the season's trade; so that instead of keeping so many work-women on, and giving them not constant employment, that you might give them constant employment and allow them to work extra time when there is a pressure in business.

6625. And you think that in very busy times something of that kind might have occurred, but it is not frequent?
It would be quite exceptional.

6626. Lord *Monkswell.*] You put in an account of a meeting of your employés that was held?
Yes.

6627. Did you take down the names of those attending the meeting?
I had nothing to do with it.

6628. Did any of your partners?
No, not that I am aware of.

6629. Was there any record kept of those who attended?
The foreman of the different tradespeople that were there could come and speak to that.

6630. One of your partners, Mr. Regnart, was there, was he not?
No; I believe he will deny the fact on his oath.

6631. You say that none of your partners were there?
Not one.

6632. And, so far as you know, there was no record kept of who attended the meeting?
Not any. I further believe from what I am informed that not one of our principal men in the whole of the firm attended, and that it was entirely attended by workpeople.

6633. "Mr. Regnart, manager to the firm, acknowledged the kindness invariably shown by these gentlemen"? This is quoted from the Report in the "Daily Telegraph," handed in by you.
You will ask Mr. Regnart about that. That is how they sometimes cut down the reporter's notes. It was meant by that that the speaker was saying that Mr. Regnart, generally speaking, acknowledged the kindness; I saw the report myself and raised the question. I am certain he was not there.

6634. I think the accusation brought by Miller with regard to the cheques is somewhat mistaken by you; the allegation is not, as I understand it, that less money was given on the cheque than the amount on the face of the cheque, but that on his objecting to a cheque, and on his demanding cash instead, the statement

statement was altered, and a less amount stated to be due, that is to say so much per cent. "overcharge" would be written across the statement?

Neither contention is correct, nor is there a word of truth in it.

6635. Of course if a man had no account at the City Bank or had overdrawn it, clearly it would be an object to him to get cash or an open cheque?

We should be only too happy to assist him in doing that.

6636. Then did you make it known that crossed cheques could be made open, which you say was the case?

If ever a man was given a cheque and said "Can I have this cheque made open?" they would say "Yes" directly.

6637. But Miller's statement is this, in answer to Question 2324, that he goes up, and "the cashier asked me if I would have it in cash, or whether I would have it in a cheque, as he had no time to stop; I told him the cheque being big I should require the cash. When I got the cash I found instead of 5 per cent. off it was 20, which I considered was 15 per cent. for cashing the cheque. I made a complaint in the counting-house, and they said it was nothing to do with them, they only had to make out the amount according to the amount on the statement, and if I objected to it I had better go downstairs and see Mr. Regnart"?

Mr. Coupees, the cash clerk, could only have given a cheque. If the amount of the account is over 4 *l.*, there must be a cheque drawn for it; and such a statement that he makes there is a deliberate lie, and that you will find confirmed by other people.

6638. He did not say that he did not get a cheque. I thought you said the other day that it might be that your cash clerk would, in order to oblige a manufacturer, give cash instead of a cheque?

No, I did not say so; he would cash the cheque.

6639. That would be the same thing; the man might at all events get cash for it?

Yes; after he has endorsed his name on the back of the cheque; but he would be bound to sign his name on the back of it, and then ask the cash clerk to oblige him by cashing the cheque.

6640. That might happen?

That might happen; and the cash clerks will tell you on their oaths that no one has ever been charged one farthing for cashing a cheque.

6641. You have said very often to-day that Mr. Regnart can speak better than you as to various matters that have been brought before you. I suppose you leave a great deal to your partners?

I cannot do everything myself.

6642. You therefore have confidence in them, and if there was a dispute you would sooner believe them than the other person?

I fancy my judicial mind is such that I should listen to everything that is set before me.

6643. Have you, as a matter of fact, gone into any dispute between one of your partners and another person?

I have often, and decided against the partners, and should do so again, if I thought them wrong.

6644. Is your cash clerk a partner?

Yes, he is, Mr. Rayner.

6645. I understand you to say that these partners have the superintendence each of them of a particular branch of the business; you say that there are seven partners?

Yes.

6646. Would their remuneration depend on the profit they made out of their particular department?

No, not at all, on the whole concern, the same as for myself.

6647. As regards the contract, you say that if it was a verbal contract the order would be always entered in the order book; would the order be signed by some person authorised to make the contract in such a way as to be evidence against you?
Decidedly. The order is a printed order with a counterfoil, and the order is written out, and on the counterfoil it is recorded.

6648. And who signs it?
This order is initialed by the buyer giving the order, and we have never disputed any order in our lives.

6649. I understand the allegation to be as regards wages that in general in most firms there is an implied contract to continue a man at the same rate of wages, unless notice of reduction is given?
Decidedly.

6650. But the allegation against your firm is, I understand, that wages are reduced sometimes without notice, that notice of reduction is not given?
I have never seen that allegation yet.

6651. At all events you say that is not so, whether it is alleged or not?
No.

6652. I thought there was such an allegation?
There is the allegation of a man who says that he had to take 5 *s.* off and did not agree to take it; he was paid for doing a job, and he was told that he ought to take 2 *l.* 10 *s.* instead of 2 *l.* 15 *s.*, and he refused to take it; and he was paid the 5 *s.* eventually.

6653. *Chairman.*] I suppose the discrepancy that appears to exist between what you have stated and what Mr. Dickson wrote, arises from the fact that you mentioned the various payments that had been made, and he mentioned of various transactions which have occurred?
Yes, the invoices.

6654. Is it not the custom to have a settlement of accounts every three or four months or so, or kind of running account?
No; the usual rule is that these small makers are paid every week; but Mr. Dickson says himself that they were paid once a month, which is the way in which they are, I believe, paid, generally speaking, at the West End, but with us they are paid every week. The large manufacturers of carpets, bedsteads, and all such things, crockery and everything, are paid once a month. We pay up to the end of the month before the 10th of the following month.

6655. Could you explain to the Committee the various departments that your business is divided into, and the heads of them; you spoke of Mr. Regnart and other managers and buyers?
Other junior partners, managers and buyers.

6656. You have seven junior partners?
Seven junior partners.

6657. Are they at the head of seven different departments?
Yes, wherever they appear they are the heads.

6658. How many departments are there?
There are departments and then sub-departments of those departments.

6659. For instance, Mr. Imlay, whom you have mentioned?
He is the foreman of the stuffing department.

6660. Who would be over him?
Mr. Regnart.

6661. How do you describe Mr. Regnart?
Junior partner.

6662. Besides being a junior partner what is he?
We have not a name for him.

6663. Does

6663. Does he exercise a general superintendence?
Not only in that department of Mr. Imlay's, in the manufacturing departments generally, more so than any other junior partner.

6664. Who is the head of the manufacturing department?
He is. Then there is Mr. Corp, and then there are lots of other men; a man of the name of Jones with the mattress makers, a man named Borton. They are sub-divided out, but they pass through Mr. Regnart's hands.

6665. And then after Mr. Regnart things come before you and your father?
Then they come before us.

6666. What would be the process if a man had any dispute as to his wages or anything; he would complain first of all to the foreman, I suppose?
He would complain to the foreman, and if he does not consider that his grievance is redressed by his application to the foreman, he would take further steps.

6667. He might go to Mr. Regnart?
He might go to Mr. Regnart or come to me. Sometimes they come to me without going to Mr. Regnart or any other junior partners, if there was a question raised.

6668. You are always accessible?
Always. I am not as you know there all the day now, but I have even been there this morning for an hour-and-a-half, something like that.

6669. You do a large business with foreign countries, you said?
A large business.

6670. How are orders obtained in the trade generally, or by your firm in particular; are there any agents over here who come to you?
Sometimes shippers and such people buy from us for shipment abroad, and at other times we send our representatives over. We have just had two representatives return with some very large orders, a designer and a salesman, with very large orders for India; and we have a man taking some very large orders in Buenos Ayres; we have opened a place there for the time being to make ourselves known; in fact we search for orders wherever it is possible, and wherever the tariffs are favourable for us.

6671. But a shipper getting an order would put it out to you or to some other firm to execute?
Decidedly; shippers come and buy.

6672. There is one matter I am not sure I understood about, the order books; does the price appear in the order books?
Yes.

6673. The price and all the particulars. You told us that when a man entered into a verbal agreement the order was entered in the order book?
If the man wants it.

6674. But not unless he wants it?
No.

6675. I understood you to say that it was a regular part of the course of business that the order was entered in a book?
No; if a manufacturer taking a verbal order wishes to have a written order, it is written in the book, and also on the counterfoil, and the order is given to him.

6676. That is only if the man wishes it?
That is all.

6677. Earl of *Limerick*.] Do you keep nothing in the way of a remembrance of what verbal orders are given; are there no notes kept?
The buyers may make some notes themselves, but there are never any disputes about these things, and I presume that the system works satisfactorily. If I did answer the question just now otherwise, I must say that this is what I intend; there are no two ways about it.

MR. EDWARD RAYNER, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

6678. *Chairman.*] You are one of the junior partners in Messrs. Maple's firm?
Yes.

6679. Can you tell us what your special functions are in that firm?
I have the entire management of the counting-house, and with your Lordship's permission I will read a short statement.

6680. I think I would prefer asking you some questions?
It will directly traverse some of the statements of Miller.

6681. You say you are superintendent of the counting-house?
Yes.

6682. Are you specially concerned in the putting out of the work that is bought in; do you exercise any supervision over that?
Not the least; I have nothing to do with the buying.

6683. But do you know who in the firm especially has to do with the buying?
Different buyers, a buyer in every department.

6684. You can speak only as to the payments?
Yes.

6685. How long have you been the head of the counting-house?
Since 1876.

6686. How do you know what sum has to be paid to any particular man; do you get a statement before he comes to you, or does he come to you and present it?
He very often comes and presents it; sometimes he might not come with it.

6687. If he does not come with it, have you got it beforehand?
We have it beforehand, yes.

6688. What is the general custom?
There is no general custom; it is as often one way as another. If we have monthly accounts we should have the statement beforehand. Sometimes a man will bring in goods to-day and come up and get the cheque at the same moment, keeping the invoice in his hand; we should pay him there and then.

6689. Do I understand that you would give him a cheque for the amount in the invoice?
For the amount passed by the buyer; sometimes it is on the invoice; sometimes it might be several invoices attached to a statement; other times it might be a single invoice.

6690. Will you explain that; if there is only a single invoice, would the custom be for the buyer to endorse or to write upon the invoice anything that was taken off for overcharge, or any other remark?
Yes, he would write upon the invoice anything that was to come off, if anything was to come off.

6691. And then the man would bring in his statement and invoice, and you would draw a cheque for the amount stated in the invoice?
Yes.

6692. But if it were a number of invoices, then a different statement would be prepared?
He would bring a statement of the separate invoices.

6693. With the amount written off, if any, in the same way?
Yes.

6694. And

6694. And then on the presentation of that statement you would give him a cheque for the amount?
Yes.

6695. Or in the case of a monthly account you would have the statement sent to you?
Monthly statements generally come by post, and we remit them by post; the cheques are paid to the different manufacturers.

6696. Whom do the statements come from?
From the manufacturers.

6697. Does the statement always go through the hands of the manufacturer before you see it?
The statement is made out by the manufacturer before it is sent to us.

6698. I thought it was made out by the buyer, with the deductions?
No, the statement is made out by the manufacturer.

6699. But it goes through the hands of the buyer?
The buyer would see it probably, and sign it, before we should pay the cheque.

6700. And write off anything, so that if there was any deduction you should make that deduction from it?
Yes.

6701. Then does it go back to the charge of the manufacturer or remain in the charge of the buyer?
Not necessarily go back, but he might see it before the cheque was drawn

6702. I want to understand that: is it possible that a man having taken his invoice to the buyer, would get the cheque without having seen the statement in which a reduction had been made for some cause or other?
I am not sure that I understand the drift of the question.

6703. I want to find out whether it is possible that a manufacturer, having brought in his invoice to the buyer, should go up to you to get a cheque for the invoiced price, and that a deduction has been made upon his statement, which statement he would not have seen in the meantime, and therefore on coming to you for a cheque he would not know the amount that was due to him?
No; if he brought me the invoice he would know if there were any deductions on it.

6704. But I am supposing that he does not bring you the invoice?
Then he might not know.

6705. That is to say, his invoice having been for 50 *l.*, he might come to you for a cheque for 50 *l.*, but on being shown his statement, might find that there was 5 per cent. or 10 per cent. taken off for some reason?
No; the only discount that would be taken off would be according to arrangement, and the deduction to appear on the invoice.

6706. But you said that he might not bring you the statement?
He might not bring it.

6707. Lord *Thring.*] Take this case: I am, we will suppose, a manufacturer; do I, or do I not make out a statement, we will call it, or the invoice?
You make out the invoice and also make out the statement.

6708. But when I have made out the invoice, what do I do with it?
If you want the money you bring it up to the counting-house there and then.

6709. Does it not pass through the buyer?
The buyer signs it.

6710. Take it by steps; I am a manufacturer and I want to get my money; do I or do I not make out in my own hand an invoice bearing a statement of the money I expect to get?
Yes.

6711. What do I do next?
The buyer signs it and you bring it up to me.

6712. Do I carry it to the buyer?
The buyer is by your side when he marks the goods off; if you bring in the goods the buyer sees them and signs the invoices there and then.

6713. Then that is the case with the invoice?
Yes.

6714. When I go with the goods the buyer looks at the goods, and he either signs the invoice without any deduction or signs it with a deduction; he either passes the goods as being well done or takes off a certain sum because they are badly done, does he not?
Yes, he would pass the invoice.

6715. Is not that the case?
The buyer would pass the invoice.

6716. Supposing he does not pass the invoice; supposing he wishes to make a deduction, does he or does he not deduct it there and then?
It would be deducted there and then, if the man wanted the money, certainly.

6717. The buyer does deduct it there and then?
Yes, according to whatever he arranges with the manufacturer; it is all done by arrangement.

6718. If I bring in that chair (*pointing to a chair*) to the buyer, and the price that I ask is 3 *l.* 10 *s.* on my invoice, and the buyer says: "This is not a good chair, I shall deduct 10 *s.*;" does he not take off the 10 *s.* from the invoice there and then?
Probably he would, but I am not a buyer myself; I can only tell you what I believe to be the facts. If you want to get it more exactly you had better consult Mr. Regnart when he comes before you.

6719. *Chairman.*] All you know is that in some cases the man will come to you with an invoice, or a statement of several invoices, and an amount written on it, and you will give him a cheque for that; in other cases you get the statement beforehand, and the man comes for his cheque, and you look up his statement, and you see what he is to get, and give him a cheque for it?
Yes.

6720. That is a correct way of putting it?
I think so; I do not see any objection to that way of putting it.

6721. You do not know whether of necessity a man must know what the amount on his statement is?
I do not know that he would know of necessity; not in every case.

6722. Lord *Thring.*] He can know, cannot he; does not the statement come from him; just give a case by way of explanation?
He would know the amount of his statement, certainly.

6723. Always?
He would know the amount of his statement.

6724. But you said he did not always?
He would not know probably what the cheque was going to be drawn for; he would not know the exact pence we took off for discount, the odd pence perhaps.

6725. If I send in a statement, do you mean that I do not know what you are going to take off?

Supposing

Supposing the amount is 85 *l.* 16 *s.*, and supposing I take off 2½ per cent. off that.

6726. Does he not know that you are going to take off 2½ per cent.?
Of course.

6727. Then he knows what you are going to take off?
Suppose I take off 2 *l.* 3 *s.*, or 2 *l.* 2 *s.* 10 *d.*

6728. Does he not know what you are going to take off?
Not the exact pence, I might take off 2 *l.* 2 *s.* 10 *d.*, or I might take off 2 *l.* 3 *s.* If they were even pounds he would know.

6729. If it is your duty to take off 2½ per cent., what reason have you to vary it?
I should not vary it beyond the odd pence.

6730. *Chairman.*] I understand you to mean this: that a man might know that his statement had written on it 10 per cent. off for over-charge or something of that kind, but he would not know the exact sum of money that that 10 per cent. would represent; and therefore until you gave him the cheque he would not know the exact number of pounds, shillings, and pence he was going to receive?
If it were even pounds and you took off 2½ per cent., he could fix the exact figure.

6731. Lord *Thring.*] Suppose instead of taking off 2½ per cent. you took off 3 per cent., would he or not know?
He would know, of course.

6732. You mean that every man cannot calculate within a farthing the true percentage?
Yes, that is what I mean; we might take off 2 *l.* 2 *s.* 10 *d.*, or we might take off 2 *l.* 3 *s.* off the imaginary amount I gave.

6733. *Chairman.*] On page 239 in answer to Question 2467, Mr. Miller gives this evidence: the question is, "What do you do then; what does he give you?" and Mr. Miller says, "You tender him your invoice, and then if you wanted the money in the week you would go upstairs." What does he mean by "go upstairs"?
Go to the counting-house.

6734. "Say the suite was delivered upon a Wednesday, and you did not want the money out of the usual way, you would go away and wait till Saturday; he would take your invoice, and on Saturday you would go up to the counting-house for the amount; then you would see what you were going to receive." Is that correct; that implies that the man would know what the price on the invoice was; that he would part with the invoice, but on Saturday he would go upstairs to the counting-house to get his money, and that not till then would he know what he was going to receive?
He would receive whatever was due to him less the arranged discount.

6735. That is to say, that having parted with the invoice no discount could be taken off after he had parted with it?
Certainly not; only the arranged discount; no other discount would be taken off.

6736. How can you tell that; can you speak to that of your own knowledge?
We should only take off the discount as marked upon the invoice by the buyer.

6737. But what has been inferred in that answer is, that the man parts with his invoice, say, on the Wednesday, and that he does not see anything more of it till he goes up to the counting-house to get his money on the Saturday; and not till he gets there does he know what he is going to receive; that is to say, that

that a discount may be taken off the invoice after he has parted with it; you cannot speak to that of your own knowledge?

The cheque would be drawn for the amount of the account as passed by the buyer.

6738. All that you can speak to is the fact that you pay the cheque according to the invoice or statement as it comes to you?

Yes. What I have come before you principally for is to deny that we charge for cashing cheques.

6739. I was going to ask you as to that; you do cash cheques occasionally?

We oblige these men sometimes by cashing a cheque.

6740. When a man comes to you and says, "I should be obliged if you would give me cash," then you give him the money or a cheque; is that so?

No, we never pay by cash over 4 *l.*; we always pay by cheque and give him a cheque. Sometimes he will ask us to oblige him by cashing it; perhaps he is pushed for time and does not want to go to the bank, and then if we have got the money in our cash box, we do it for him.

6741. You give him a cheque, say, for 50 *l.*, and then you cash it?

Yes, we always pay by cheque, and sometimes oblige him by cashing the cheque, but never think of charging a farthing for it.

6742. You never give him a cheque for a smaller amount because he requires cash for it?

Certainly not; it is a gross fabrication.

6743. Of course you cannot speak to anything that takes place prior to the matter coming before you in the counting-house?

I cannot speak as to the buying, only from hearsay.

6744. When did you say that you came into the counting-house?

I have been with Messrs. Maple in the counting-house for 25 years.

6745. Then you were there in charge during the time when all these alleged transactions took place?

Yes.

6746. Are you often asked to cash cheques?

Very seldom indeed.

6747. Are you often asked for open cheques instead of crossed cheques?

Occasionally we are, and we never refuse them.

6748. Earl of *Onslow.*] When the invoice is sent in, into whose hands does it go first; into the hands of the buyer, does it not?

Into the hands of the buyer.

6749. And he marks any deductions which will be made?

Yes.

6750. Whether for overcharge or for discount?

Yes.

6751. Then you simply draw the cheque for the invoice as it is handed in to you by the buyer?

Yes.

6752. Therefore you are not responsible for any deductions that may be made for overcharge or for discount?

No, we should simply draw for the amount of the account as passed by the buyer.

6753. Lord *Monkswell.*] I understand that you cannot under any circumstances alter the statement or invoice; it is not your duty under any circumstances to alter it?

No, we should not alter it.

6754. And

6754. And you never have altered it?
No.

6755. Earl of *Onslow.*] Is it part of your duty to mark the cheque "Please pay at counter," when the client asks to be paid in cash?
Our cashier would do that; sometimes I should do it if the cashier were out of the way.

6756. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] There is never any difficulty made about it.
Certainly not; no difficulty whatever.

6757. Earl of *Limerick.*] Do you know of any custom of paying cheques very late on the Saturday afternoon?
No, I do not suppose on Saturday we pay 10 cheques altogether.

6758. What are the days of the week when the cheques are given?
Friday is the principal pay night; we pay, I daresay, on a Friday 150 cheques; we get a few stragglers coming in on Saturday, amounting to 10 or a dozen, perhaps.

6759. Have you got any knowledge as to Mr. Miller's cheques; in particular with regard to the day on which he ordinarily received his cheques?
He received cheques every day in the week.

6760. *Chairman.*] I think most of them were paid on a Saturday, were they not?
I think most of them were drawn on a Saturday; but he could have them on any day he liked.

6761. Earl of *Limerick.*] Could you explain how it was that the bulk of his cheques were paid on Saturday?
I think in this way; that the bulk of the goods were not brought in till the Saturday morning; it was generally driven off till the last moment, and he would want the money the same day.

6762. But could he receive the cheque as soon as the goods were delivered?
If he wanted it; but it was an understood thing that we paid once a week. If he was pressed for money on any particular day he could have it.

6763. Once a week, but not on a Saturday, as the regular day?
No, Friday night.

6764. And if the goods had been delivered on any day of the week before Friday the cheque could have been got on the Friday?
Certainly.

6765. *Chairman.*] I think, speaking from memory, that more than half the total number of Miller's cheques were paid on the Saturday, or about half?
I think that is so.

6766. Would his case be exceptional?
His case is very exceptional; he was always late; he drove things to the last moment.
Is there anything further you wish to say; you said that you had a statement that you wanted to read out; is there anything you wish to say which has not been covered by the answers you have already given?
6767. There are one or two other things; it will not take five minutes if I read the whole of it.

6768. Will you do so?
I am a junior partner in the firm of Maple & Co., of Tottenham Court-road. I have the entire management of the counting-house. It is our custom to pay all accounts exceeding 4*l.* by cheque, which cheques are crossed in the printing; should anyone ask for an open cheque we give him one by stamping it with the words, "please pay at counter." Occasionally for the convenience of the holder of the cheque, cheques have been cashed by myself or by our cashier, Mr. Coupees. It is not the duty of anyone in our firm either to draw a cheque

or cash a cheque excepting myself or Mr. Coupees. We have the sole and entire charge of the cash. I have read the statements made by Mr. Arnold White and also by the witness Miller, and I affirm that it is utterly untrue that, when cashing any of our cheques, any deduction of any kind has ever been made from the full face value of the cheques. I have been with Messrs. Maple for 25 years, the last 12 years of which I have had the chief control of the counting-house; and if such a transaction had occurred it would most certainly have come under my knowledge. I say most positively no such transaction ever came to my notice, and I further say that it is entirely false that any sum of money has been deducted from any cheque which has been cashed by the firm in consideration of the money being paid or otherwise. I now beg leave to refer your Lordships to Question No. 2335. Miller there says that on one occasion we lent him 100 *l.* to be repaid 5 *l.* per week, and that we deducted from his account two instalments of 5 *l.* each, but on the third week deducted 92 *l.* 10 *s.*, the last 2 *l.* 10 *s.* being a charge for the accommodation; now fortunately the books for the period during which we had any dealings with Miller are all in existence. I have carefully examined these books, and I find no entry or record of any such transaction or that we ever lent him any money whatever. I have looked through the whole of Miller's account with our firm, and I most positively deny that any such deductions as those referred to by Miller were ever made.

6769. Lord *Thring.*] Were ever made by your firm, that is to say?
That any such things as those referred to were ever done by our firm. The other point to which I would refer your Lordships is in the answer to Question 2370. Miller there says that we purposely withhold until Saturday payments which are due on Friday. This is utterly untrue. I speak with full personal knowledge of the facts, and I deny the allegation absolutely.

6770. *Chairman.*] On that latter point do you mean to say that you do not withhold payment, but give a man a cheque whenever he comes for it?
Quite so.

6771. As far as your firm is concerned, you say you never withhold payments?
Certainly not.

6772. But you could not speak as to whether the preparation of the statement or invoice is delayed by another department?
I have never heard of such a thing; I should not think it likely.

6773. And you say that you cannot trace in the books any of these deductions that Mr. Miller says were made?
I have looked through the whole of the accounts and deny that any such deductions were ever made.

6774. You cannot find them in the books?
No, and I have looked through them.

6775. Can you produce the accounts?
We can produce the ledgers.

6776. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Mr. Maple said that occasionally loans were made by the firms to various manufacturers for the purpose of putting up machinery?
Yes.

6777. Would those loans appear in a separate account?
That would be an entirely distinct transaction.

6778. Appearing in a separate part of the books, not in a man's ordinary working account?
Yes.

6779. *Chairman.*] They would appear in the books?
Certainly we should have a record of them.

6780. As

6780. As far as you know, with regard to all advances that have been made to manufacturers, a record of them would appear in the books of the firm?
Certainly.

6781. Would they appear if they were made by Mr. Maple or Mr. Regnart as a matter of private transaction?
If they advanced money privately we should have no record of it.

6782. You superintended the department that you are in?
I superintend the counting-house.

6783. You do not draw the cheques yourself?
Only in the absence of our cashier.

6784. Earl of *Limerick.*] Supposing such a thing as a private transaction to have taken place it would be impossible, I suppose, for the money to be paid back by way of being taken off in the payment of an account without your knowing it?
It would be impossible; Miller says in his evidence that it was deducted from the account.

6785. That could not happen, you say?
That could not happen; I have referred to the accounts, and no such deductions were ever made.

6786. Because even if the original loan were a private one, it would not have been paid by a deduction from the account?
No.

6787. *Chairman.*] When you say that no such deductions were ever made, do you mean that no deductions of that amount or of a larger amount were ever made?
No deductions of any kind whatever for money lent.

6788. But I say do you mean no deductions of any kind?
I refer to these deductions which he speaks of for money lent and interest on money lent.

6789. But I mean were deductions made that he might have assumed were made for that purpose and not for other reasons?
I have no doubt there have been deductions made by buyers at different times for different defects.

6790. But I mean deductions that would show in his account?
I have no doubt there have been deductions.

6791. Earl of *Limerick.*] No such deductions as 92 *l.* 10 *s.*?
No.

6792. Earl of *Onslow.*] Or a sum approaching it?
No, not anything like it.

6793. *Chairman.*] No deduction that he could have assumed might have been made on account of that transaction?
No.

6794. Lord *Monkswell.*] Might not he and the buyer have arranged between them to deduct this 92 *l.*?
But I have seen the ledger myself, and if the deductions ever took place they would show in the ledger.

6795. But suppose he came to the buyer and said, "I have produced 300 *l.* worth of work; I am quite willing only to have 208 *l.* for those goods;" then it would appear in the invoice as 208 *l.*?
But it is impossible to be done like that I should say.

6796. *Chairman.*] That would have to be done by arrangement between the buyer and the manufacturer?
It would be very unlikely for it to be done in that way.

6797. But it could be done in that way without appearing in the books?
It could, but I think it not at all likely.

6798. Earl of *Limerick.*] If it were done in that way it would throw out the amounts for the price of the article, would it not?
It would throw them out, and make them all wrong together.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. FREDERICK COUPEES, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows.

6799. *Chairman.*] You are the cashier?
I am the cashier at Messrs. Maple's.

6800. Have you anything to add to the evidence which has been given before the Committee?
Nothing but a general statement, and a statement with regard to a few things stated by Miller and Mr. Arnold White.

6801. I do not think the Committee require anything repeated; if you have anything to say as to the cashing of cheques that has not been mentioned by Mr. Rayner, we shall be glad to hear it?
No, I really think there is nothing fresh to add except emphatically to deny the allegation that we ever cashed cheques, and charged for doing so.

6802. You entirely corroborate what Mr. Rayner has said on that point?
Entirely.

6803. Earl of *Limerick.*] Such a thing could not have happened without either you or Mr. Rayner knowing it?
It could not possibly have occurred without my knowing it during the time I have been cashier.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Veneris, 6° *Julii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of DERBY.
Earl of ONSLOW.
Viscount GORDON (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord CLINTON.
Lord CLIFFORD OF CHUDLEIGH.
Lord FOXFORD (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord ROTHSCHILD.
Lord MONKSWELL.
Lord THRING.

LORD KENRY (EARL OF DUNRAVEN AND MOUNT-EARL), IN THE CHAIR.

MR. DAVID GARDINER IMLAY, is called in, and having been sworn; is Examined, as follows:

6804. *Chairman.*] You superintend the upholstery and stuffing department at Messrs. Maple's, do you not?
Yes.

6805. Are you the foreman of the upholstery and stuffing department?
Of the upholstery stuffing, I should describe it. I may say that I have got a short statement here which I should like to read, if it is your pleasure.

6806. I will ask you some questions at present. I want to ask you a question or two as to the subdivision of labour in your department. The work of upholstering is subdivided into a considerable number of branches, is it not?
Only two.

6807. What are those?
There is only the fixing of curtains and loose casing, and the stuffing of furniture. The only two that I know of now are what is called the upholstery, such as the fixing of curtains and loose casing, and stuffing. I may say that during the time I have been in the trade I have passed through the whole of what might be called the original upholstery trade; that is what I was trained to. I was trained to cut carpets and sew them, to cut curtains and make them, to cut loose casings and fit them on.

6808. What casings do you refer to?
The loose casings that go over furniture.

6809. Have you mentioned all the various descriptions of work that you were trained in?
I might include paper-hanging; paper-hanging when I went into the trade, was a part of the upholstery trade.

6810. Any more?
No, I do not think I could say that there are any more.

6811. When you went into the trade it was customary for a man to be taught all those various branches of the trade?
Yes, in the country.

6812. Was it not the case in London also?
I could not say.

6813. How long have you been in the trade?
Thirty-six years.

6814. How long in London?
Twenty-eight years.

6815. And what was the custom 28 years ago in London?
What it is now.

6816. What is it now?
The state of things now is that the carpets are taken away, the curtains are taken away, the loose cases are taken away, and there is only left what I call the major part of the work, the more important, the stuffing.

6817. What do you mean by "taken away"?
It has gradually got sub-divided.

6818. That is what I want to get at; I do not understand now what you mean by "taken away"?
I suppose they found that by applying labour to one particular section of the trade it is better for the workman as well as for the capitalist that it should be so.

6819. And what you mean by "taken away" that they are not done by one and the same person?
Not done by one and the same person.

6820. I think you have mentioned at least five or six different descriptions of work that used to be done by one person, and are now done by five or six?
That is the case.

6821. Then upholstering is not merely sub-divided simply into two, the stuffing and another, but into five or six, or more sub-divisions?
Yes; only what we speak of now as legitimate upholstering are the curtains and loose cases, as I explained to you before, and the stuffing.

6822. The other branches of the trade which formerly were done by one and the same person are now done by other people?
By other people.

6823. Whom you do not call upholsterers at all?
No; we speak of carpet planners and carpet layers, and paperhangers, and so on.

6824. So that the upholstery trade consists now of the two branches of stuffing and, what is the other?
The upholstery fixing.

6825 The other portions of the trade having been as it were taken out of the trade altogether?
Exactly.

6826. And you say that the present condition of things existed in London 28 years ago?
Twenty-eight years ago.

6827. And no change has taken place?
Not that I am aware of.

6828. None whatever?
Not that I am aware of.

6829. Of course you would be aware of it if it had?
Yes; but I do not know what other firms may have done, apart from the firms I have been in.

6830. Have

6830. Have you been in the same firm all the time?
No. I was at Smee's for 12½ years, at Clements and Halsey's for about three years, and I have been at Maple and Company's for about 12½ years.

6831. With regard to this subdivision of which you speak, does it allow of a larger portion of the work being done by apprentices or boys?
Yes. For instance, the piecemaster (of whom I may say I have been a determined foe all through my life) can subdivide it, the piecemaster, or what you might call the sweater.

6832. What I asked you was whether the trade, being thus subdivided, that subdivision does not enable a large quantity of work to be done by boys which was formerly done by men?
I should say it could be done.

6833. But is it not done?
Among those men, the piecemasters, I believe it is; I do not know whether I might use that term, because it is a term that I am more familiar with than "sweater." I do not know what the meaning of sweater is. The "piecemaster" is the middleman as coming between the capitalist and the worker.

6834. But is it not the case in large firms that more boy labour is employed than formerly?
I cannot speak of large firms; I can only speak of the one I am in personally.

6835. Is not that a large firm?
Yes, I should say it was.

6836. How is it in that particular firm?
I do not know, I am sure.

6837. But are more boys employed now than formerly?
There are more boys at Maple and Company's now.

6838. More boys in proportion to adults?
No.

6839. Would you say that the adult male labour bears the same proportion now to the boys as it did 15, 20, or 25 years ago?
I could not answer that question.

6840. You mean that you do not know?
I could not for a certainty answer it.

6841. Within the last 12 years, could you say?
I could not say; I have no personal experience.

6842. Do you know how many hands are employed in your department?
Yes, I have got the numbers here. Would you like me to read them?

6843. Yes?
Ninety-four men over 21; 29 apprentices under 21; 10 improvers under 21.

6844. What do you mean by "improvers?"
An "improver" is a young man that comes from the country, that wants training to get into what might be called London work and London style.

6845. Does the "94 men" include yourself?
No.

6846. Does it include the sub-foremen?
Yes, because my sub-foremen have got to work.

6847. Does it include the salesmen?
No.

6848. Or all the porters?
I have got five porters.

6849. How many out of that 94 would be artizans making up the goods.
They are all artizans.

6850. You say you have got five porters; they are not artizans?
These five porters are not artizans.

6851. Can you tell me how many of the 94 are artizans?
Ninety-four.

6852. The porters are not included in the 94?
No, the porters are not included in the 94.

6853. I thought you said they were?
No.

6854. Then there is nothing included in the 94 except men absolutely employed in upholstering?
Upholstery stuffing.

6855. And how many boys?
Twenty-nine.

6856. What are they employed in?
They are employed in learning the trade.

6857. Stuffing?
Stuffing.

6858. And the improvers; what are they employed in?
They are employed in learning the trade too.

6859. Cannot you tell us whether that is about the same proportion that there has always been in your department. There are now 94 men, you say, and so many boys, and so many improvers; since you have been in charge of the department has it been about the same proportion?
Yes, the same proportion.

6860. Not more boys now than formerly?
No.

6861. Can you tell he Committee how many men were taken on in your department last year?
No.

6862. You do not know?
No.

6863. How is that if you are in charge of the department?
Of course men come and go. If the shop does not suit them they clear out and other men come in.

6864. Do not you know how many came and how many went last year?
I could not tell.

6865. Who does know?
By referring to my wages book I could find out, I suppose.

6866. You could tell in that way?
Yes. I did not know I should be asked the question to-day.

6867. The rate of wages has been complained of before the Committee; can you tell the Committee what the rate of wages is in your department?
The maximum is 51 *s.* 3 *d.* per week of 53½ hours, or 11½ *d.* per hour. The minimum, I should say, for artizans goes down to about 27 *s.* or 28 *s.*

6868. Do you mean for men?
For men.

6869. Would

6869. Would you look at this (*handing to the Witness the Statement of the list of workpeople given in by Mr. Maple, and pointing to the column headed "Stuffers"*). I suppose you prepared that portion of it yourself?
I gave it from my wages book.

6870. Can you tell the Committee how many of the men are receiving 36 *s.* or over per week?
I have not gone into it. This is the wages sheet for two men (*handing in a sheet*). I do not think that will show it.

6871. Can you tell me what is meant by "dropping time"?
I do not know what they mean by dropping time. I will give you an illustration.

6872. But you do not know what the meaning of the term is, you say?
As witnesses have explained it in the evidence, as I have read it, I do not understand it.

6873. Do you understand it according to your own view?
Yes.

6874. Will you tell us what your view is?
There are two men say, we will take A. and B.; I will give those two men two chairs; the price of each chair according to piecework would be 14 *s.*, the time-work taken at 36 *s.* per week divided over 53½ hours would be 8 *d.* per hour. A. does his chair in 21 hours, B. takes 23 hours; B. would have to drop his two hours; but I should not say that he dropped it, because the next job that he got he might be more expert at, and he would pick up that two hours again. That is the only dropping of time that I understand.

6875. That is to say that B., works two hours longer than A., and does not get paid for it?
But it does not affect his money at the end of the week; he generally manages to make it up.

6876. He does not get anything charged to his credit for that extra time. One man works 23 hours, the other 21; the one who works 23 hours gets paid the same as the one who works 21.
Yes; because it would be an injustice to the man who did it in 21 if the one who did it in 23 was to be paid more.

6877. But I mean, as a fact, the other man works two hours for nothing?
Yes; because he does not happen to be such a good workman.

6878. I will read you what Mr. Baum said about this; it is on page 299, and at the end of the answer to Question 3055; he says: "The particular system on the premises of Messrs. Maple, and which we would describe as sweating, is a system by which a workman who is working the whole week at a wage, it may be, of two guineas, or whatever it may be, should, at the end of the week, the work he has done not be the value of his wages, does not receive the wages for the whole time that he has worked; that is to say, supposing a man has worked six days, he may receive the wages for four days only. It is common for men to drop one day, half a day, or a day and a half; but I have known cases where the men have dropped three days of their time. This happens more particularly in what is known as the leather floor." That you cannot speak about, I suppose?
I am prepared to answer all questions. The witnesses I have brought will confirm what I say.

6879. Is it correct that a man could drop as much as one day, half a day, or a day and a half, or even three days in the week; that is to say, that owing to any cause he would work one day, half a day, a day and a half, or three days in the week for nothing?
He must be a rank duffer if he did.

6880. I ask is it possible; has that occurred to your knowledge?
The only time that such a thing may have occurred is some years ago, when I changed my system. I must tell you that my system must be entirely disassociated from Maple and Company. If there is any blame to be attached to that system it must rest upon me.

6881. What do you mean by your system, the system in your department?
And worked out by myself. I may say that when I changed from piecework to day-work, I gave the men a month, from three weeks to a month, to clear their books. In all piecework shops (it was the same with myself when I worked piecework) men are apt to let work fall behind; that is, to get into debt. I know when I left Smee and Sons I was something like a fortnight in debt, and I had to work very hard to make that time up.

6882. Will you axplain what you mean by being a fortnight behind in debt if you were working piecework?
It is really what may be called the technique of the trade; but, perhaps, I can explain to you in this way. Foremen are very often lenient to men. Of course I could not in Maple and Company's be lenient to any men; but in certain shops it is very often the case that if you first-stuff a job, that is, if you do the first part before the morocco goes on, the foreman will allow you to charge if you do not happen to have a good week on the first-stuffing. Supposing that the first-stuffing of that chair, for example, was worth 1 *s.* 6 *d.* or 2 *s.*, he, perhaps, will allow you to charge 2 *s.* 6 *d.*, and sometimes I have been allowed to charge the whole thing. That has been put on one side, and when the man leaves the shop, he is naturally expected to complete that job.

6883. You are paid beforehand you mean?
You are really paid beforehand. Of course I may say that when I adopted timework or time task work, I took the maximum rate of pay which these men had earned under piecework and adopted that as their regular wage that they were to earn in 53½ hours per week. One man (I need not mention names because there have been too many names mentioned in this inquiry already) I tabulated at 2 *l.* 5 *s.*, that was the highest amount that he had made; but when he came to work under the time task work I found that he could not earn more than 2 *l.* 2 *s.*, and I expect that that was the case that was referred to in evidence, because that is the only case that I can recollect where a man dropped any time. I expect that he dropped that time which he really owed to the firm, or to the department. That is the only case of dropping I know. If I might be allowed to explain, knowing the great crisis that was taking place in our trade in the way of sub-division of labour, I knew very well that a good many would have to go to the wall if they were not assisted. I may say that I have assisted those men, and I have tried to pay them as highly as I possibly could for a week's wage, so that they might earn their living; and I have not the least doubt but what those men at the end of the week were really not able to keep up with the smart workmen that I had in my employ in that department, and I should not be surprised but what these men have been compelled to drop time. There is nothing wrong in it; it is merely a question of A. and B.; that the man did not earn the same money, or could not do the job so expertly as a smarter or a younger man. That is the only way that I can explain it.

6884. When did this crisis you speak of occur?
It has been going on for 28 years; I have watched it.

6885. You can scarcely speak of a crisis lasting 28 years?
The sub-division has been going on; the gradual dividing up of the labour.

6886. The change towards sub-division has been going on gradually, you mean?
Yes.

6887 And you anticipated that that would have a disastrous effect?
Yes; I am confident that it has upon the old class of workmen.

6888. And

6888. And you endeavoured to help them over that difficulty?
Yes.

6889. Is there any piece-work done in your department
Time task-work; it really amounts to piece-work.

6890. I mean, is any work done on the old principle of absolute piece-work?
No.

6891. It is all done now in what you call time-work?
Time task-work.

6892. That is to say, that a man is paid a certain wage for a certain number of hours, provided that he turns out a certain quantity of work?
Yes.

6893. Then if he does not turn out that quantity of work, what happens?
He does not get the money.

6894. Or he has to make it up?
They always make it up; it is very rarely that this dropping goes on.

6895. Then you say that this dropping time is a very rare occurrence?
A very rare occurrence.

6896. You can only call to mind one instance of it?
I have got two at the present time, something of the same sort. I have got to push them on as much as I possibly can, but, of course, there is no fund that they can be paid out of for those hours; I mean that my system allows of no surplus fund that they can be paid out of for the time that they take longer over their job.

6897. How do you decide what each man is to make; how much he is to make in the 53½ hours?
I have decided that, because I do not believe in unlimited piece-work?

6898. How do you decide it; have you got a regular scale of work laid down according to which so much ought to be done in 53½ hours?
Yes.

6899. Do you vary that from time to time?
Very rarely vary it.

6900. Does every man know what he is going to get for his 53½ hours?
Yes.

6901. And how much work he has to do for it?
Yes.

6902. And if he drops time it only means that he has not produced the quantity of work which he was to produce in the time?
Yes.

6903. And that he has to work extra to make it up to get his full wages?
Yes.

6904. Then it would not be correct to say that a man would not know what he was going to get paid for any particular work he had to do; stuffing a couch, or anything of that sort?
No.

6905. He knows when he begins exactly what he will get?
He knows when he begins.

6906. You have told us that you think this subdivision has had a bad effect upon the working men; do you think it beneficial or the reverse to bring up a man, teaching him one particular branch of the trade, such as stuffing, or, for him to be taught the various branches of the trade?
Of course to be taught the various branches is to be made a complete upholsterer. I am sorry to say there are very few of them left. I should be glad

glad if some system could be adopted by which that could be done, but I am afraid it can only be done by technical education.

6907. But should I be correct in saying that a young man who has learned all the branches of the trade would have a better chance of getting employment and bettering himself at home or of getting employment if he emigrated, than a man who knew only one branch, say the stuffing part of the trade?

As I said, the stuffing is what might be called the major part of the trade. I should say that a man who was good at upholstery stuffing would be the better man, I mean a man expert at it. Of course a man who was an all-round upholsterer would be the man who, if he emigrated to the colonies, would be better; but in this country I should say that the man who was an expert stuffer. I do not like the word "stuffer"; it is a nasty word; a man who was good at doing upholstery stuffing would earn more money at the present time than a man who is an average workmen all round.

6908. In other words you mean that a man who was very expert as an upholstery stuffer could earn better wages than a man who was only tolerably expert in the various branches of the trade?

Yes, precisely so.

6909. But under the old system a man could become expert in the whole business, could he not?

No, I should not like to say so. Of course, if you keep a man at a particular section of the trade he will get so expert that he will earn good money. I have men with me who very rarely take less than their 51 *s.* 3 *d.* all the year round, because I keep these good men on all the year round by making up for stock, and so on. But there is one remarkable thing which I may mention. When I have asked some of my apprentices, when their time was out, if they would care to take a turn for a year or two at the upholstery fixing, I have not found one go.

6910. They would not earn so much at it?

They would not earn so much; but I thought they would like to learn it.

6911. Do you think that a man wishing to leave, you, being a stuffer, and nothing else, would have as good a chance of getting work in other firms in London, or in the country, as if he could do the covering and other parts of the business also?

I think so.

6912. Then why did you say just now that this sub-division is disastrous to the working people?

In this way, that I am told that the sub-division has mainly arisen from what might be called the piece-master system, which I have laboured during the whole time I have been in London to try and put down, if possible. When I came to London 28 years ago, I found the germs of it in Smee and Sons. There were only two as far as my knowledge of London went then who might be called middlemen. One was a German, and he supplied Smee and Sons with most exquisite work; I must say that I have never seen work like it. I found that the ware rooms were being gradually filled with these goods, and I have often spoken to the men and said, "Could not something be done to try and stop the gradual increase of the middleman?" I not only laboured in the shop in trying to stir up the men, but I likewise laboured in the trade society.

6913. Which society?

The same society as these witnesses, Baum, and Brown, and Shaughnessy, belong to. I may tell you that I found I could not remain longer in the society after reading Baum's evidence. However, I may tell you that while in the society I struggled anxiously to get the society to do something. I said: "You cannot allow those men to go on increasing at the rate they are doing"; and it was at that time I heard of Maple and some of the firms who employed those middlemen. I said: "We ought to do something as a society; we cannot go on merely paying men 15 *s.* a week out of our funds week after week, when

when we know that these men are getting up and subdividing our labour; cannot something be done?" I got a Committee appointed, a Committee of some of the best men in the society. We sat for months, and drew up a most elaborate scheme of co-operation, based upon what I believe will ultimately be the solution of this question, that is the co-operation of labour and capital. We proposed to rent a factory and to employ our men, and whatever other labour we might require for the purpose of supplying these firms who were getting their work done by the middle-man; and I believe that if that scheme had been carried out in its entirety, the middle-man would have disappeared; but unfortunately (I am sorry to confess it) because of the apathy of working men, that scheme was never even considered. A special meeting of the society was called, and after the preliminary business was got over, they simply left the hall and that scheme was dead. I resolved then that I would work it out.

6914. When was this?

This was about 20 years ago. I was then cashier of the trade society. I resolved then that I would work on my own hook, to use the familiar phrase. I resolved, on the first opportunity that I got, to apply to Maple's for the situation of foreman; I was then employed as foreman at Clements and Halsey's, in Holborn; I applied for the situation, and I had one definite idea in my mind, namely, that the system that I should inaugurate and ultimately develop in Maple and Company's, should be based upon four cardinal principles; and I say that those principles I hold to the present time, and I say that those principles I have carried out. They are these: An extreme, almost severe, system of economy with regard to materials; an almost scientific system of costing the work.

6915. You mean seeing the price on it?

Yes. A minimum of profit for the employer, and the maximum rate of value for the men's labour. And all the difficulties that have occurred with these witnesses, more especially the witness Brown, I may say occurred in my developing of this system. For years I stood in terror. The piece-master waited for the shop to be smashed up so that he might get back again. I may say that when I went to Maple's the piece master or middleman was a power.

6916. The piece-master outside, you mean.

The piece-master outside. He was then a power; now he is at a discount, and entirely dependent upon whether I have got the work out of my department so that he might come in. That is the way matters stand.

6917. Is much bought in from the piece-master in your department now?

There is none bought in to my department, because mine is the manufacturing department; but the buyers are compelled at times to buy in.

6918. To buy the same work as you make in your department?

Yes; only I can make it as cheap as the piece master by my system, and pay the men good money.

6919. Your system being to do away with piece-work and substitute what you call time task-work?

No; my system is to do away with the middleman, the work being produced instead under time task-work, or what might be termed piece-work.

6620. What you did was to do away with piece-work, and to substitute this what you call time task-work?

Yes. I may tell you why I did that. I found when my apprentices got up to perhaps the third or fourth year, that, of course, I was compelled to put them on with men, piece-work men; and (I suppose it is in human nature) these men when the job came to be valued, naturally wanted part of the boys' time put in. Of course I could not afford to give the boys' time to the men; the boys had cost me money for the first two years; for the first two years the apprentice is not of much value to any foreman. I naturally said "I cannot afford to give you the boys' labour; I think the better way would be to take the maximum

rate of this money you have been making at piece-work, and I will pay you for the time at 11½ *d.* per hour that you may be at work on the job with the lad; and that was my main reason for adopting time task-work.

6921. I think you told the Committee that every man knows perfectly well when he goes to work, first of all how much money he will receive for his 53½ hours' work; and, secondly, how much work he has got to do in that 53½ hours?

Yes.

6922. It has been stated to the Committee that such is not the case; you are aware of that?

Yes; I suppose you refer to the witness Brown; I notice that he complains of a particular suite of morocco, and he says that two men selected to do this work in the shop, and that he had a price for the suite, and that the 5 *s.* which I deducted was from the price of the original suite. Now he speaks of two shops, one having been got up on what he calls the day-system——

6923. What is the number of the answer that you are alluding to?

4460, page 434. The question is, "In the day-work shop the men were paid by the hour?" and the answer is "Yes; I started work for them in the day-work shop, and the very first week they would not give me what I worked for. I went into the firm, I might say, in the first instance, under stress of weather. I would never have thought of looking there for a job had I not been hard up; and, as I have said, they would not pay the money that I actually earned there. (*Q.*) Was there any money agreed upon?—(*A.*) There was no money agreed upon, but you were supposed to get what you were worth; but there was a fixed limit, 50 *s.* being the limit, and I wanted that, but that they did not pay me. (*Q.*) Fifty shillings was the lowest limit or the highest, do you mean?—(*A.*) The maximum. Just to give you an idea that I was not asking for anything more than I considered properly due to me, the foreman that there is now selected two men out of the day-work shop to do the best ordered leather work that came into the place, showing that I was worth the maximum, as far as my ability as a workman was concerned. They cleared the place for two of us, and the very first week, though I had worked to, say, 2 *l.* 12 *s.* or 2 *l.* 14 *s.*, all I could get from him was about 2 *l.* 4 *s.* I would not have objected to that if the balance had gone on to the following week, but it was wiped off altogether, and a clean sheet was started. They were actually defrauding me of 4 *s.*, 5 *s.*, 6 *s.*, and 7 *s.* a week, as it went on."

6924. That would be in your department?

That would be under me. Of course I do not like to say that the thing is a palpable lie, because I have no facts to verify it. When I saw in reading his evidence that he had a little book, I wished I had a little book; but my books do not go back further than seven years, and I cannot verify his statement; whether there was an act of injustice done or not I should not like to say; all I can say is this, that the day-work shop was not started in any way with the idea of competing against men, or lowering their wages; it was to assist them. I selected a man to take the foreman's place; plenty of men may be first-class mechanics, but they may not have the adaptability to become foremen; but, unfortunately, that day-work shop came to smash, and I had to take the men over on to my piece system; and this is the only thing I can think of from recollection, that it is just possible that the larger sum may have been paid in the day-work shop, and that when I came to fix the price for the second suite I found I could not pay it. I merely hazard that statement; but I may tell you that the leather shop has been the worst job to me——

6925. Is the leather floor under you?

Yes. The leather shop has been the greatest torment of my life that I have had, and I will tell you why the witness Baum speaks of the superiority of Maple's leather work. It was well known in the trade before I undertook it. The piece-master who did the largest share of the work at that time was one of the finest mechanics, I suppose, that you could find in England; and (for the purpose

purpose of making money, I suppose) he subdivided the labour to such an extent, and brought the price of what might be called morocco work down to such low ebb, that even now it is hard work for those men to get up to the mark.

6926. Up to the mark in quality, do you mean?

In quality and in wages as well. It was for this very reason that I resolved that the men employed by me should be mechanics, and not the mere machines which a piecemaster would turn out. I resolved that a man should take a job, and that he should do that job right out, from the frame right up to the finish; and I say that in doing so, and in competing with what might be called the piecemasters, who had subdivided the labour up so much, there occurred my difficulty. Perhaps you do not understand my difficulty.

6927. Are you speaking of the leather floor?

The leather floor.

6928. No, I do not?

I do not suppose you do. I will take that chair (*pointing to a chair*). The piecemaster would give that chair to a boy; that boy would first stuff that chair (that is, the part underneath the morocco): that is web, hessen, hair, and gauze. Then there would be a foreman who would mark the groundwork of the chair, where those buttons are; he would then have a paper pattern, he would mark the groundwork of that chair; he would cut all this morocco out, and then he would give that morocco to a man to do; and the same system would be applied to all the other work, that is, that the simpler part of the work would be done by boys; the foreman would cut out all the morocco and get them sewn, the man would merely come and take the material, the moroccos, and go and put it on, then he would finish the job up to a certain extent, and then a boy would take it in hand again and put on what might be called the outside, backs, and bottoms, and so on. So that in a given case, taking the illustration of A's chair and B's chair, and taking the chair that is paid 14 *s.* for, he could so subdivide that labour up that he could get it done for 7*s.*?

6929. And you get it done outside?

I mean the piecemaster outside.

6930. Earl of *Onslow.*] The hand would be working on his own premises?

Yes, on the piecemaster's, or what you call the middleman's.

6931. *Chairman.*] How do you overcome this difficulty?

Just by my system.

6932. Perhaps you will explain to the Committee how that would overcome it?

I found that Mr. Blundell Maple in particular, and Mr. Regnart were willing to assist me in every way. At the building of the factory that I am working in at the present time, I may say that Mr. Maple consulted me all the time. I believe it has been the anxious wish of the firm, more particularly of those two men, that the work should be done on the premises, so that they should know what was being put in the goods, because, of course, when the work is done by a piecemaster working off the premises, you cannot tell what he is putting in, and it was their wish that they should know what was being put in the goods. I may say that my factory is divided into four floors. Mr. Blundell Maple consented to put up stock rooms at the end of each room, to assist the men in every way in getting the materials for their work, so that they should not have to come down to the ground-floor, and to save them all the time he possibly could; and I may tell you that the men abused it, and we had to give it up; they simply knocked the boys behind the counter down to get the material. The system is this, that each man gets a sheet on which are placed all the articles that he is to use in that job. The costing clerk had got a specified amount of material that that job is to take, and he had to work it out so as to leave the maximum of value for the men's labour. I may say that no working department can be carried on under 15 per cent., and then from that of course you have got to take rent, taxes, and management, which leaves the

 capitalist,

capitalist, Mr. Blundell Maple said, 9 per cent. I did not think it left him 9 per cent., and I told him so next morning. I am confident it is wrong; it does not leave him 9 per cent. after all this is taken from him. I know very well that in working my system I have kept down the expenses of the management as low as I possibly could. My own wages have not varied for 10 years, and they are no more than many foremen of upholstering in London get at the present time. I will show you what I get, but I do not wish to make it public because it may injure other foremen; the employers may say, "If that is all Maple gives, we will not give you any more. (*The Witness points to an entry on the pay-sheet.*) I say that, because it had been said that I make a good thing out of it and grind down the men.

6933. You say that the costing clerk cuts down the value of the material as much as possible?

As much as possible, so as to leave the man a good price for his work. Then he goes to the stock room to get his material, and that material is checked in two books. During the progress of his work his time is taken down by the working foreman, on the back of the sheet each day. That sheet, when the job is finished, passes from the working foreman into the office, where the costing clerk then enters it into a book, all columned up with the same materials as on the sheet. Then, when the job is finished and ready to go, either out to a customer or into stock, that is invoiced. As I tell you the principle of the thing is economy and thrift.

6934. What was the result of this; did you succeed in making the articles as cheap as the piecemaster could make them?

Yes, very nearly; the firm do not trouble if I am a little over.

6935. That is to say, for nearly half the amount that they previously cost, you told the Committee that what you could make for 14 *s.* the piecemaster could make for 7 *s.* I understand that owing to the system which you introduced, you are enabled to make the work as cheap, or nearly as cheap, as the piecemaster?

Yes.

6936. That is to say for about half the money it cost previously?

No; I mean to say that under my system the men get the 7 *s.* that the piecemaster gets.

6937. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] You mean that Messrs. Maple have to pay about the same, but that instead of the piecemaster getting it all, the difference is given in wages to the men?

Yes. A the present time I pay about 200 *l.* in wages, and that 200 *l.*, if the work was done by piecemasters, would go through their hands.

6938. *Chairman.*] A certain piece of work, you say, costs 14 *s.* to make, but the piecemaster can make it for 7 *s.*?

That is not the way to put it.

6939. That is the way you put it yourself, I think?

I beg pardon. You may have taken it so, but that is not the way I have put it. I say that if you take a chair which I pay a man 14 *s.* for doing, the piecemaster could get that chair, by his method of subdivision, done for 7 *s.*; the labour, I mean.

6940. Not including the material?

No.

6941. What would be the relative value of material; do you include material in 14 *s.*?

No, I am only speaking of labour.

6942. Then I understand you that the chair, the labour of which cost you 14 *s.*, the piecemaster could produce at a price the proportion of which due to labour is 7 *s.*?

That is the way to put it.

6943. But

6943. But that, owing to the new system you introduced, you succeeded in reducing the cost of it as far as labour was concerned?
Not reducing the cost. I did not wish to reduce the cost; I only said that legitimate labour should get its value.

6944. Lord *Thring.*] I understood you to say this: that the piecemaster paid 7 *s.* for labour?
Yes.

6945. And he took 7 *s.* for himself?
Yes.

6946. That you paid 14 *s.* for labour, and therefore the workman gets the difference beyond 7 *s.*?
Yes, that is it.

6947. *Chairman.*] You did away with the profits of the piecemaster, in fact?
Yes.

6948. Why was a change of system necessary to do that?
There was no change of system.

6949. You told the Committee that you were enabled to do this by introducing a new system, but if you mean to convey to the Committee that you merely saved the difference of the profit that the middleman made, obviously that would require no change of system to bring about?
I do n t know that I said that I changed the system. I said I developed the system which brought that about.

6950. Whether you used the word "changed" or "developed" you mean that you made some development?
Yes.

6951. I do not clearly understand in what way; it seems to me if all you mean is that you saved the profit of the piecemaster, then that merely resulted from making the article at home instead of getting it from the piecemaster?
Yes.

6952. That is what you mean?
Yes, that is what I mean.

6953. Lord *Thring.*] You increased the wages of the workmen by the difference of the profit of the piecemaster?
And the advantages that he derived from sub-dividing of labour.

6954. *Chairman.*] By carrying out the work in your own shop?
Yes.

6955. Lord *Rothschild.*] I suppose before you developed your system the piecemaster's work was cheaper than the work carried on at Maple's?
No; I should not like to say it was cheaper.

6956. As far as I understood you, when first you became foreman of Maple's the piecemaster was a great institution?
Yes.

6957. And that you have done away with?
Comparatively speaking.

6958. And, therefore, I suppose before you developed your system, the piecemaster could do the work more cheaply than Maple himself?
But he had not done it before.

6959. *Chairman.*] I understood you to say that at one time the piecemaster was a great institution?
Yes.

6960. That a great deal of work was obtained from him?
Yes.

6961. But your object was to do away with him?
Yes; and I have done it?

6962. And at the time when a great deal of work was obtained from the piecemaster, I presume it was the case, was it not, that the piecemaster could do the work cheaper than it was done on Messrs. Maple's premises?
What time do you refer to?

6963. The time when you say the piecemaster was a great institution?
But I was the first foreman they had?

6964. I understand you to say that at one time, when you went there, the piecemaster supplied a great deal of the sold goods?
Yes.

6965. In your department?
Not in my department; they were outside men.

6966. That piecemasters outside supplied a large amount of the goods sold by Messrs. Maple?
Yes.

6967. I presume the reason why a large quantity of goods were bought from the piecemaster was that the piecemaster manufactured them cheaper than they could be made on the premises?
But how could they tell? They had had no experience of work being done on the premises.

6968. Do you mean that no work at all was done on the premises?
Not much, I think.

6969. You do not know?
I knew of very little if there was any; I do not think any.

6970. I understood you to mean this: that when you went there, the whole, or nearly all the class of goods that are made in your department, were bought from the piecemasters outside?
Yes.

6971. That you wished to do away with that?
Yes.

6972. And that you set to work to get these articles made on the premises?
That is it.

6973. And that you have succeeded in doing so, that you can get them made as cheaply as they can be supplied from outside?
Yes.

6974. Have you anything more you wish to say on that point?
No. I shall be pleased to say anything you think necessary in elucidation.

6975. I have gathered from you that you think that the existence of the piecemaster is prejudicial to the trade generally?
I do not "think" so; I am certain of it.

6976. And you think that it would be a healthier condition of things if all the work in your trade were executed on the premises?
I say that no one ought to step between the capitalist and the maker but the foreman.

6977. He ought to be the only intermediary, in your opinion?
The only intermediary.

6978. I gather from what you say that in your opinion the best system of doing away with the middleman would be that the system inaugurated by you should be more widely carried out?
You flatter me, my Lord, but I think so.

6979. At

6979. At any rate you find it answer in Messrs. Maple's?
Yes.

6980. You have handed the Committee a statement of your salary; do you receive any percentage on the profits of your department?
No. For the last two years I have received from Mr. Blundell Maple a present, because I have carried out some big work such as the Metropole and the Victoria Hotels, and several other large jobs; he thought that I had worked very hard, and the last two years he gave me a present

6981. Your regular salary is not augmented by a percentage on the profits?
No.

6982. And you say that under your system there is more money available for wages than is possible under the piece master system?
That is it.

6983. To your knowledge, are the employés in your department generally satisfied with the rate of wages?
I do not know; I do not find working men satisfied with the rate of their wages.

6984. I mean have there been any strikes or attempts to strike?
No, there have been no strikes.

6985. You have never had any strikes in your department?
No; there have been some disturbances, but no strikes.

6986. Do your apprentices generally remain in the shop after they are out of their time?
Generally speaking; I generally advise them for their good to go away, to take a turn round.

6987. Do they often go?
Very rarely. During the 12½ years that I have been at Maple's there are only 13 who have left and gone into the trade. There are 20 who have completed their apprenticeships; one is foreman of a shop under my supervision, and six have gone as salesmen.

6988. You spoke about the leather just now. Take the case of a couch, or lounge, covered with morocco the wrong colour; in such a case as that would the workman have to do the work over again without receiving any pay for the extra time required?
Of course I do not know of any case, but if a man is so stupid as to put on the wrong coloured morocco----

6989. I mean if he was supplied with the wrong coloured morocco. It is sufficient if you say that you never knew of such a case; if that is so, I will not ask you more about it?
I cannot recollect a case. When reading over this evidence to the young fellow who is foreman of the shop, he said something about a shilling which was taken off. All that he could recollect about the shilling was about five years ago when another man was foreman of the shop. It seemed that a man spoiled the pad of a chair, and that the foreman of the shop mulcted him in a shilling, which is nothing particularly hard. I have paid for the whole skin when I have marked it wrong in another firm when a workman.

6990. The allegation made before the Committee was that it might happen that a man would be obliged to work to make good some default in the work, which was not due to his own carelessness or fault at all, but due to the fault of a boy who had been employed in stuffing, or to the fact he had been furnished with wrong material, or to some fault of the foreman, and that in such a case he would be obliged to make that good, without receiving any extra pay for it?
I do not know of any case of the kind.

 6991. I suppose

6991. I suppose it must happen occasionally that there is some defect in the preliminary stages of the work; what would happen in a case of that kind?

I will tell you what has happened with me in my own experience when a workman. The foreman has given me, say, ten skins for a couch, and of course, they are laid out with the light striking on them; and it is sometimes the case that a man has got to arrange his skins differently, and unless he is very careful in shading those skins, the seat may be different from the back, and I have had sometimes to take off the whole of my back, and get new skins from the foreman when I have not matched them rightly; because I do not think you can depend upon the foreman matching up everything in a firm where there are about 18 or 20 men. A certain amount of responsibility must rest on the man doing the job; that is how I look at it. The foreman gave me the ten skins, and said, "Well, Imlay, you must match these the best way you can," and sometimes when through carelessness or otherwise, I had not matched them exactly, I have had to take them off; but I never thought of asking the foreman to pay me for not matching them properly. That is merely the custom of the trade. I never thought that anyone could make a complaint about it.

6992. Would all cases of dropping time, if they existed, come under your personal knowledge?

I should imagine so.

6993. But you are not certain?

I am inclined to think they would.

6994. Who are next under you in the department; are they sub-foremen?

Sub-foremen.

6995. They would be able to speak better on that point than you, perhaps?

Yes.

6996. How many sub-foremen are there?

Four.

6997. Can you give the Committee their names?

Yes.

6998. I want to be quite clear that I understand the way in which the rates of wages were fixed; as I understand you, you took as a basis the average amount of work that a man would turn out, supposing it were piecework, and then took that as the proper amount of work that he ought to be able to turn out in his 53½ hours' work; is that so?

Fifty-three and a-half hours; yes.

6999. And then you pay a regular rate per hour for that 53 hours' work provided that amount of work is turned out?

Yes.

7000. If it is not turned out, the workmen say the inferior workman has to what is called drop time; that is to say, work longer?

Yes, work longer.

7001. That is to say he works longer for the same amount of wage?

When you say he works longer he does not work longer hours; he does the next job that he may be more expert at, quicker, and he makes up that time that he may have dropped on one job.

7002. That, I presume, is as it happens; it may be the case or may not be the case; but what I want to get at is this: if the man is not able to produce a given amount of work, he has to work longer hours for the same rate. I think you said the rate of wages was 11½ *d.* per hour for fifty-three and a-half hours?

Fifty-three and a-half; that is the highest rate of wage.

7003. A certain amount of work must be produced for that?

Yes.

7004. If

7004. If that is not produced, the man might have to work 55 or 56 hours, or whatever it might be, to produce it; he would only get his 11½ *d.* for the 53½ hours?
Yes.

7005. That would come to the same thing, in fact, as if he got less wages for the 53½ hours?
Yes, it would amount to that, I should think.

7006. And you base the amount of work to be produced upon what the most skilful man could turn out; you base it upon piecework?
Yes.

7007. That is to say, upon what the most skilful man could produce?
Yes.

7008. So that an inferior man would practically earn less wages than 11½ *d.* per hour?

7009. Lord *Thring.*] Do I understand rightly that when you went to Messrs. Maple practically they did not manufacture at all, or very little?
Very little.

7010. You instituted the manufacturing system in Messrs. Maple's shop practically?
That is it.

7011. Then I understand you were determined to compete with the piece-master?
Yes.

7012. You did that by initiating a system in which you got full pay for the work of the men under you, paying them what you considered full wages?
Yes.

7013. Now, one word with respect to the measure of the wages; we will go by steps; 53½ hours a week was your allotted time, I think, that you thought was proper for a workman to work?

7014. We will take a particular branch of the trade, it does not matter which; I suppose you give to one branch 11½ *d.* an hour, and then less to an inferior branch, and so forth?
Would you use the word "branch"?

7015. Put it into my mouth; I mean you would give 11½ *d.* an hour to some workmen, and, of course, the workmen who are not doing so scientific a business I presume you pay less to?
Yes, that is it.

7016. Now I want to take your best workman, your 11½ *d.* workman; what is the measure by which you judge of the work he ought to produce; surely it is not the best possible workman, is it?
Well when you speak of the best possible workmen, of course that is rather vague.

7017. Tell me is it the average workmen; is your measure of work what the average workman can produce, or what the best possible workman can produce, or what a middling workman can produce; what is your measure; give it me in your own words?
Understanding that you understand the meaning of the word "cost," I will put it in this way: If I cost up a job that I have to produce, say, at 4 *l.* 10 *s.*, I then leave the largest margin that I possibly can to get that job out, allowing 15 per cent.; I leave the largest margin for the labour producing on that job.

7018. Give me an instance; we will say you are going to produce a suite of furniture for a room; would you call that a job?
I should call that a suite; I would speak of an easy chair as a job.

 7019. I understand

7019. I understand you are costing up a job; you calculate the price at which an easy chair will be remunerative to Mr. Maple; is that the way?
Allowing him his 15 per cent.

7020. Then when you cost up the job, you first of all consider what price ought to be paid so as to allow Mr. Maple his 15 per cent., and then how do you get at the residue; how do you divide the other 85 per cent.; how do you deal with that?
I know what the article is sent in for by the piecemaster; I know what he can sell the chair for, and I want to bring it out at that price. By my system I say that I can give Mr. Maple the 15 per cent. and pay this maximum price to the worker.

7021. You must consider that I do not understand it; you are a very able man, and can explain it?
I should like to explain it as much as I possibly can.

7022. My object in asking you is to know whether, in fact, the workman has or has not to work too hard?
Oh, no.

7023. But wait a moment; we will take a chair, as an instance; supposing I give you an order for that chair that is standing there, what I understand then as your object is to so price that chair that you are able to equal the piecemaster and yet to get Mr. Maple his 15 per cent.?
Yes, and pay the man a good price for the job.

7024. Now let us just learn how you arrive at that; what do you first do; how do you cost it up?
I begin to put down so many yards of web, so many yards of hessen, so many springs, so many yards of gauze, so much hair.

7025. All the materials, in fact?
All the materials, I might say; that would be the best way of putting it.

7026. What is your datum for what the piecemaster would charge for that?
I know what the piecemaster sends it in for.

7027. That is the price of the piecemaster for the time being?
Yes.

7028. Then to-day, supposing you were costing up that chair, you would know what a piecemaster would to-day charge for that chair?
Yes.

7029. That is your datum?
Yes.

7030. Of course your object is to get 15 per cent. for Messrs. Maple and to get the remaining 85 per cent. fairly distributed.
That is it.

7031. Then next you go into the materials?
I have gone into the materials before.

7032. You begin with the materials?
I begin with the materials.

7033. What do you do next?
I put the 15 per cent. on, and the margin is left for the men.

7034. Then that constantly varies, I suppose?
No, it does not.

7035. Do I understand you that a piecemaster will make that chair for a series of years at the same price?
Almost at the same price.

7036. That is the datum?
Yes, that is the datum.

7037. Then

7037. Then with regard to the workmen; in order to carry your system into effect you are obliged to get full value (I do not say unfair value), for the work?
Yes.

7038. How do you ascertain the *quantum* of work that a man ought to do. I am a workman, suppose; how do you ascertain how much I ought to do for you a week; how much in the 53⅓ hours?
By the number of jobs that you did, valued at the piece-work value.

7039. Supposing I am a new man?
I have got to find out how expert you are at your work.

7040. And then supposing you find that I am not expert (as I certainly should not be) how do you pay me then?
If I find that you are only worth 36 *s.* a week, I pay you at the rate of 8 *d.* per hour; if I find that you are worth 51 *s.* 3 *d.* I pay you at the rate of 11½ *d.* per hour; it is by the amount of work that you can do.

7041. Then going back to our instance of the chair, does one man make the whole of the chair?
The whole of the chair; not the frame.

7042. Supposing it is made by A., he would earn 11½ *d.* an hour; supposing I did it, I should earn 8 *d.* an hour during that week?
Because you would take longer time.

7043. But I mean that is the fact?
That is the fact.

7044. When I come in as a new man, and ask you to give me a job, and you say, "Yes, you may make that chair," what do you say to me, what arrangement do you make; do you tell me how much I shall get, or wait till you have ascertained it?
I say to a man when he comes in, "I give you that chair; the value of that chair is 14 *s.* in money for 21 hours at 36 *s.* a week, and so many hours to bring out the 14 *s.* at 11½ *d.*, if you can do that chair in the number of hours requisite at 11½ *d.*, I will pay you the 11½ *d.*, but if you take the 21 hours to do it I can only pay you 36 *s.* a week.

7045. Earl of *Onslow.*] Will you explain to me what is the object in paying a man by time and by the piece as well, which I understand you to do?
No, not as well.

7046. You say to the man, "I will pay you so much an hour, but in those hours you have got to turn out a certain amount of work, and if you do not do that amount of work, I shall not pay you so much an hour;" is not that so?
I do not know that that is the right way to put it.

7047. Supposing you engage a workman and tell him that you will pay him 11½ *d.* an hour, and then he does not do work up to what you think is worth 11½ *d.* an hour, do you pay him 11½ *d.* an hour?
No, certainly not; I pay him less.

7048. I think I am right in saying that you agree to pay him 11½ *d.* an hour?
I could not agree to pay him till I saw what he could do.

7049. Supposing you saw what he could do, and one week he fails to work up to 11½ *d.* an hour, then he would say that he had "dropped time," that is to say, that he had worked more than you had paid him for; what is the object of telling a man that you are going to pay him so much an hour when all the time you mean to pay so much the piece?
I was not aware that I said I would pay a man 11½ *d.* an hour unless I found he could earn it.

7050. Lord *Thring.*] Go back to our chair; you told me that you say to a new man, "That chair is worth so much money"?
Yes.

7051. "The time allotted to you to make it; that is to say, your standard time is so-and-so;" what time do you allot for making the chair, the standard time?
There is no standard time; there cannot be any standard time where you have got a variation of value in labour.

7052. I understood you that you said to a man, "Now that chair is worth 14 *s.*; if it is made by a skilful workman it would take him so many hours?"
Yes.

7053. "And if you can make it in that time, you will get so much money; if you cannot make it in that time, you will get so much less money?
Yes, that is it, per hour.

7054. I asked you, taking that particular chair there, to name to me the time in which you think a workman ought to make it; I understand you to say that that chair is worth 14 *s.*, we will say; then you have in your own mind the given time within which a good workman ought to make the chair; I want to know what that time is?

7055. Earl of *Derby.*] I suppose no two men would do the work in exactly the same time, would they?
No two men.

7056. *Chairman.*] I understood you to say that you originally based your estimate as to the length of time that it ought to take on the amount the workman turned out when working upon piecework?
Yes; if you take that standard you have it there; you will find that the only standard which I can take with regard to paying a man's labour is the piecework, or the actual money value of the job; I divide that then over the 53½ hours, and I pay so much an hour in time.

7057. But then when a new man comes in how does he know how much he could earn in making that particular chair?
I had two cases this week. Two men came in. I called one of the men down, and I reckoned up the value of his work that he had done during the two days that he had been in. I said, "According to the actual price of this job and the time you have taken on it, your money will be so and so."

7058. Lord *Thring.*] I do not understand this; the first moment I come in and undertake that job I do not know how much I can earn?
No, you cannot.

7059. Earl of *Onslow.*] But what seems to me to be the most inexplicable thing of all is why you should bring the element of time into the question at all. If you are going to pay the man by piece, why not say to him, "When you have made your chair I will pay you so much for it?"
I explained it to you, that the reason I changed from piecework to daywork was that I had to put my elder lads on with men, and when the job was finished at piecework, the men often wanted almost the boys' labour put in, which I could not afford. I said, "No; we had better come to the highest actual sum of money you have earned at piecework, and be paid so much per hour, and when working with a boy, you shall be paid for your time that you have been over the job."

7060. You only pay on time task-work then when men and boys are employed together; is that it?
No.

7061. When men are employed only, do you pay them by time or by piece?
It is the value of piecework; it is time task-work.

7062. Why

7062. Why should you bring in time at all; why not say to the man, "When you have made that chair I will pay you so much for it," instead of so much the hour?
Because I may have to put the man on with a boy.

7063. Then the boy is an essential factor in the time task-work?
It is not a question only of a boy; it is a question of putting an inferior or a superior man on to that job in the same way.

7064. And you cannot tell how much of the work each man has done, you mean?
Yes.

7065. But if only one man had to make one chair there would be no difficulty in fixing it by piece-work?
Not a bit.

7066. But the difficulty is where you have two different classes of labour working at the same article?
Yes, that is it.

7067. I want to know what demand is there in the labour market for upholstering stuffers (as you call them) as compared with complete upholsterers?
I could not tell you exactly; it is so immense that I could not speak of it.

7068. Does it not almost follow that a man who is a complete upholsterer could go to the Colonies, or into the country, or anywhere, and would be more certain of getting a job than a man who is only an upholstering stuffer?
I have never been in the Colonies, so I cannot say; but I should imagine that the man who was an excellent stuffer would be the preferable of the two.

7069. Provided he could get work?
Provided he could get work. I think it will be getting, all over the Empire, so much divided that you cannot speak of it as something which applies in this country alone.

7070. But you think there would be no difficulty in such a man getting work?
Not a bit.

7071. A great deal of evidence has been given before the Committee upon the sweating system, and the two principal evils appear to be the subdivision of labour, and the piecemaster; and, as I understand your evidence, you must have either one or the other, and of the two you prefer the subdivision of labour, according to your system that you have introduced at Messrs. Maple's?
Are you speaking in a general way of the trade?

7072. In a general way?
I approve of it in a general way; I do not subdivide in my department.

7073. But you give different parts of the chair to be made by different people instead of one man?
No; when you spoke of it "in a general way," I thought you meant upholstery fixing. There is no subdivision in my department; a man in my department does the whole job.

7074. Is your principle being adopted by other large firms?
I do not know; I am inclined to think that when they have read my evidence they will adopt it.

7075. Then you do not think it is the general practice in the trade now?
I am not aware of it.

7076. There were one or two points that I asked Mr. Maple questions upon as to which he said that he thought you could give more accurate answers than he could. The first was with reference to the evidence of Thomas Shaughnessy. In answer to Question 4539, he said that in the year 1880 when he was first employed at Messrs. Maple's, he should think there were about 50 men employed,

and that when he left in 1887, there were about 10, that the others were all boys and improvers"?

That is a lie.

7077. Then he also stated that the boys had to do some of the stuffing, and that after it was done he was made responsible for the bad work done by the boys?

That is another lie.

7078. Earl of *Derby.*] As to this question of piece-work or time-work, I understand your system to be this: you agree to pay a man so much per hour, but you do it upon the understanding that he will do a certain amount of work per hour, and if he falls short of that amount of work, then in employing him in future you pay him rather less?

No, I should not like to put it that way, because I generally try to help a man on, and if he can possibly do so to let him make it up, Men are not every day alike; a man will work one day better than another; he may sometimes take longer to do a job because he does not feel well or is out of sorts; then he will get behind in his work; but the foreman of the shop and myself will generally say, "The next job you get you will make it up." I have impressed it upon the sub-foremen that if a man should fall a little behind they should give him an easy job, so as to make up his time.

7079. So, as far as possible, not to have to change the rate at which you pay him but employ him at the same rate of wages?

Yes, that is it.

7080. Under that system, is there a separate rate of wages fixed for every individual, or do you pay so much to a man according to the class of work he is in?

According to the class of work and the ability. For instance, I may tell you that when I had a rather difficult class of work, I went down and told Mr. Blundell Maple that this work was rather difficult work to do, and I did not believe that the men could make such money as they had been earning. He said, "What do you want?" I said, "You ought to give them 10 per cent., I think," and he said, "All right;" and that has never been taken off.

7081. In the case of a new man, you have at first more or less to guess what he can do?

Yes, I should put it in that way, guessing.

7082. And according to that estimate of his capacity, you put him into one class or another?

Yes, I should put it in that way.

7083. But when he is put into one class, you do not easily, or unless there is some special reason, take him out of it?

No.

7084. Earl of *Limerick.*] I understood you to say that the price is fixed according to the piecemasters' prices; is that correct; that what you calculated the value, say for instance, of a chair, was on what it could be got for from a piecemaster?

That was what I went there for.

7085. That is what you calculated it on?

Yes.

7086. But if by competition the price paid to the piecemaster was very much reduced, would you reduce your rate of wages to meet it?

That is a very rare thing, and I use all the knowledge that I possess in the trade for the purpose of getting the workpeople their price.

7087. Take an instance of that sort; say that there was a piecemaster furnishing goods at one price, and another piecemaster said "Oh I can furnish those same goods at 20 per cent. less;" would your rate of wages be reduced to the level of the lowest price for which any piecemaster could supply the article?

No;

No; there have occasions come when a piecemaster because they are always very anxious to get Maple to buy their stuff——

7088. And they try to undersell each other?
They try to undersell each other; but in a case of that kind I generally find they either pay inferior labour, or pay boys; but I never put good men on that work.

7089. You would not reduce the rate of wages to meet the lowest price at which these piecemasters could supply an article?
No.

7090. And you have not found that there has been much fluctuation in the price of those articles?
My prices have not varied for my best work during the last 10 years. I asked the foreman of the leather shop if there were any jobs that had gone up. "Yes," he said, there were two.

7091. What proportion of your work do you call your best work?
The larger proportion, the immensely larger proportion.

7092. Lord *Sandhurst.*] Do I understand you to be in favour of an apprentice learning his work right through; that is, we will say, a man being able to make a chair right through except the frame?
Yes.

7093. As distinct from being what is known as a stuffer, or finisher, or something of that sort?
A boy is trained gradually; he begins at what might be called the preliminary part of the making, such as the first stuffing, and he will keep at that for a time, and then he will ultimately go on to finishing work, and at the end of his five years, if he has been assiduous, he will be competent.

7094. He will be a practical workman for all branches of that particular part of the trade?
Yes.

7095. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] I did not quite understand what you meant when you said that at Messrs. Maple's you could not be lenient with the men; will you explain that?
There must be a certain amount of discipline that you must pay attention to. That has been another of my great struggles. I have introduced what is generally well known in all engineering firms, and I do not suppose upholsterers are going to set themselves above engineers; engineering firms have tickets for the men coming in and going out, and I have compelled the men to have those tickets, and they have kicked against it. In some shops, for instance, in the West-end shops, there is a sort of free and easy way of going in and out that I could not have in a big place like Maple's, and I have been compelled to adopt discipline that some men may call severe; I do not myself call it severe.

7096. Did you ever explain to the men that in the system that you have been working upon, it was not your intention primarily to secure more profit to the employer, but primarily to secure a better position to the workman?
Over and over again; and allow me to add that instead of appearing before your august body, where I ought to have appeared, was before a committee of the society I belonged to, and to have explained to them my system, which I would willingly have done in spite of the apathy that they have shown towards me.

7097. You mentioned that a man on first coming into the shop, could not know for certain what he would earn, that you had practically to form a guess what he would be worth?
Yes.

7098. Would not that give occasion to some difficulty such as the quarrel which seems to have arisen between you and Brown who gave evidence; perhaps

perhaps he expected more money than eventually you thought you could pay him?

I should say so. I must say that Brown is the only one of the witnesses that I attach any importance to; he is one of the most excellent working men I have come across, and barring his malicious and vindictive lying, he is a man I have a great respect for. There is only one part of his evidence I want to draw attention to; it is where he says I made the remark that the tendency of the wages is down, down, down, and down they must go. I say that that is a vile and unmitigated lie. The whole of my life has been a protest against such an atrocious doctrine. I do not believe during the time that I was at Smee and Sons in the City, that anyone man laboured more than myself to get them up. I found the wages at 36 *s.*. and when I left, with the assistance of other men, they were 46 *s.*, and in some cases 48 *s.* I headed an agitation throughout the City, and laboured for years to get 10 per cent. on the prices of the men's work and on their wages, and I succeeded in most of the shops in the City; and for anybody to come before a body of Lords and say that I used such an expression as that; that is one of the things which brought me here.

7099. Earl of *Onslow.*] Just look at the answer to Question 4481, in Mr. Brown's evidence, and will you say whether you agree with the latter part of it: "In the bringing of the wages of the work-people down, his own go up. It seems to me that there is a premium on the grinding that the foreman can use on the employés, so that his own nest may be all the better feathered. In a place like that, I do not know exactly, but I think I could prove that his wages may have gone up 50 per cent." I only want to know whether you say that is not true?

Most assuredly not. I have shown you my wages for the last 10 years.

7100. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] I will not go into the other points on which your conduct is criticised; I may assume that you will give a denial to those accusations?

Do you mean about swearing?

7101. Yes?

I have sometimes lost my temper; I was worried by these piecemasters, and they wanted to get the place smashed up. I am not of a very easy disposition, and may have used language which I regret. I can only sit on the chair of repentance, as far as that goes; but I will tell you what I can say, that not a man among them, or a man who has worked with me, ever could say that I bore them malice or ever injured a man.

7102. There appears to have been a misunderstanding on the part of the witness Brown as to the mode in which he was to be paid, was there not?

Yes; I suppose that was from suddenly coming from a day-work shop into my shop; that is the only way I can explain it.

7103. Reverting to the question of middlemen, you spoke of excellent work when you were at Smee's firm which was provided by a German middleman?

Yes.

7104. Do you know how he obtained the workmanship?

I think he had got some Germans with him. I never was in his shop, and could not tell exactly how he worked it. I suppose it was on something of the same method of subdivision adopted by the other middlemen or piecemasters; I know it was exquisite work.

7105. That was the sort of way, I suppose, in which the system came into vogue; employers found a good quality of work offered to them at a reduced price?

Yes.

7106. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] The imaginary chair we have had talked about you said would cost 14 *s.*; do you get that price given to you; are you told by Mr. Maple, or one of the managers above you, that there is an order for these

these chairs at 14 *s.* a-piece, and then do you take it to the workshop and cost it up; is that how you do?
No.

7107. Do you start by giving the price of 14 *s.* to Mr. Maple or the manager?
Mr. Maple or the manager has nothing to do with it.

7108. You say it costs 14 *s.*, and you say that that is the price; I do not understand whether you arrive at the price by your knowledge of what the piecemasters are charging for that particular article, or whether you have that price given to you, and are told to turn out a chair, or your portion of the work of it, at 14 *s.*?
I will give you a better illustration, perhaps. A salesman comes up and enters in my book, "Lord Aberdeen, a chair." The price of that chair comes out so much; that is, I have to produce it at 4 *l.* 10 *s.*, and I then go into the cost, and after I have cast up the whole of my material, and put on Maple and Company's 15 per cent, what is left is for the men.

7109. I understand all that, but I want to know how you get at the 14 *s.*?
I may say that Maple and Company assist me in every way; they are very large buyers——

7110. I will put my question in another way; are you conversant with the prices which the piecemasters are charging for particular pieces of work?
Yes.

7111. What I want to ask is, how you keep yourself conversant with those prices?
Of course it is marked in plain figures what the things are sold for in Messrs. Maple's shop.

7112. Then you compare that with other things that he gets from the piecemaster?
Precisely.

7113. Lord *Monkswell.*] If a man does more than his task in 53½ hours, does he get more than his agreed pay; he works for 11½ *d.* an hour practically on piecework?
Yes.

7114. At the end of the week, supposing he has done more than what you consider the fair amount of work that you set him to do for the 53½ hours, what happens?
He has the time over.

7115. For next week?
Yes; he has so much leisure, or if he wanted to go away for part of a day he could do that.

7116. You said the time was calculated according to the time taken by the fastest workmen; when you find the workman doing more than the agreed time task, or doing the agreed task in less time, does it occur to you that that is a reason for rearranging the 53½ hours' task to make him do more work in the 53½ hours?
No, I never think of such a thing.

7117. About the boys; I do not quite understand what you do; do you fix a rate for the boys?
3 *s.*, 5 *s.*, 7 *s.* 6 *d.*, 10 *s.*, and 20 *s.* for the five years.

7118. How do you fix this 53½ hours' standard then; is your standard the time it would take a man and a boy to do the work in, supposing a man and a boy are working together; I do not understand how you calculate the boy's wages?
I take as much as I can out of the boy.

7119. But how do you calculate the task that the man has to do; if you take your 53½ hours' task to be a particular amount of work, then if some men have boys to help them and some have not, the men who have boys to help them get better off than the men who have no boys to help them if the boy's work is calculated at nothing?

I did not say it was calculated at nothing. I calculate it at as much as I possibly can. If a man is working with a boy, say 12 hours, if that man's pay is 11½ *d.* an hour, I pay him 12 hours at 11½ *d.*; then I take the rest for the boy.

7120. Whatever remains over you credit to the firm as being for the boy?

Yes.

7121. Lord *Rothschild.*] I suppose if a chair costs 4 *l.* 10 *s.*, if Mr. Maple can get 4 *l.* 10 *s.*, for it you begin by deducting the 15 per cent., and then the cost of materials, and then whatever remains over you give the men. The job costs 4 *l.* 10 *s.*, you deduct 13 *s.* 6 *d.*, that is the 15 per cent.; that leaves 3 *l.* 16 *s.* 6 *d.*; the material is 1 *l.* 16 *s.* 6 *d.* we will say, that leaves 2 *l.*; 2 *l.* are wages for the men who works six days a week or four days a week on that job?

You are taking an imaginary case?

7122. An imaginary case?

Yes, that is right.

7123. *Chairman.*] I suppose the rate per hour of wages that a man is to be paid, and the amount of work that is to be turned out in those 53½ hours is settled by you or by whoever may be foreman?

Between us.

7124. You mean that in settling the rate of wages you settle between you and the man?

Between me and the foreman of the shop.

7125. But I mean is it without reference to the man?

No; the man is consulted as well; his time is taken, and he is told "The amount of work you have done on this job is worth so and so, that brings it up to so much an hour; that is what you will be paid. If, as you become more acquainted with the shop ways and get more experience ——"

7126. I understand that; that is not quite answering my question. What I mean is this: The head of the department and the foreman settle whether a man shall receive 11½ *d.* an hour or any less sum, judging for themselves by experience of what the man can do; and also the head of the department has decided what amount of work ought to be turned out during the 53½ hours in a week's labour; that is settled too, I understand, by the head of the department and the foreman, or the head of the department alone; not through consultation, or in consultation, with the workman?

You see your question covers such a large ground that I cannot exactly say. You see you go from the actual job to the week. The only way that a man's value can be estimated on a particular article is, as I have explained, after pricing the materials ——

7127. I only want to know whether the value of the man is estimated in consultation with the man, or by the head of the department himself?

In consultation with the man.

7128 Do you talk the matter over with the man as to what amount of work he ought to be able to do in 53½ hours, and how much an hour he ought to be paid?

That is it.

7129. It is not arbitrarily settled for him?

Oh, no.

7130. Then

7130. Then if a new man comes in, we have heard from you how his value is decided; I suppose he would probably have an estimate of his own value, and judge precisely what he ought to get by what other men were getting for the same work, and so on?
Yes.

7131. Then if he found that he did not get so much, he would think himself aggrieved?
He would grumble.

7132. His value having been assessed by you, but, as you say, in consultation with him?
In consultation with him.

7133. But he would not be consulted before you assessed what he should get?
Not before.

7134. Then you would talk the matter over with him?
Yes.

7135. I think you said there were four foremen under you?
Yes.

7136. Can you tell me how their wages are paid; are they paid regular salaries as sub-foremen?
They are paid 2 *l.* 15 *s.* per week, and they have got to do so much work.

7137. They are paid so much per week, and are obliged to do so much work for part of it?
Sometimes if they have got difficult work, and they have to assist the men, I cannot expect a great deal from them, but I expect them always at least to make up 30 *s.*

7138. And is it the case to your knowledge that the men under them do that work for them?
No.

7139. I mean is it ever the case that the work is not actually done by these sub-foremen?
The work is actually done, the 30 *s.* is actually done by them, but, of course, the remainder is made up by them; they have got to train the boys, for instance——

7140. I understand that the sub-foreman is paid a regular rate of wage for doing the duties of his position, whatever they are, and also he is obliged to perform a certain amount of work?
Yes.

7141. I want to know whether that amount of work is ever done for him, or often done for him, by the men?
No.

7142. Do you know whether there is much bought in of the class of goods you make in your department at present?
Of course when I am very busy with orders they are compelled to. For instance, I am very busy just now, and I expect that they are really compelled to buy in.

7143. A great deal is being bought in now?
Because I am so busy.

7144. Who inspects the bought-in goods?
The buyer.

7145. They do not come under your inspection?
No.

 7146. I think

7146. I think you said it was very difficult to detect any defect in quality?
Very difficult.

7147. Therefore the work bought in might not be so good as the work you produce?
There is no better in England than I produce.

7148. The question I asked was, the work bought in might not be so good as the work you produce?
I am sure it is not.

7149. Do you have anything to say in settling the selling price of the goods as a rule?
No.

7150. I presume your department is more or less in competition with these large piecemasters outside?
Yes, more or less.

7151. What would occur if a piece-master offered to execute an order or make a class of goods such as you make, at a lower rate; you would have to reduce your cost of construction, I suppose?
No, I would not.

7152. You would not reduce it?
No, I would not.

7153. Then would not the goods be bought in instead of being made by you?
As I have told you, Messrs. Maple and Company would prefer having all their best work done on the premises under me; and they invariably do.

7154. And it is the inferior work that is bought in?
It is the inferior work.

7155. Then you would not say that your department was in direct competition with the piecemasters for that work?
No, I would not.

7156. You said you first of all calculated the price of the materials used, and then allowed for the profit on the capital, and so on, and then the rest went to wages?
Yes.

7157. Therefore if you are obliged to produce cheaper it would have to come out of wages?
No; that is one of the tricks of the trade. I could not tell you how it would be done, but it would be done. The wages would not be affected.

7158. There are only three factors you mentioned; the cost of material, the interest on capital, and the rate of wages?
Yes.

7159. If the production is cheapened it must come out of one or other of the three?
Well I always manage not to touch the wages.

7160. Is what you make made chiefly for stock or in the execution of orders?
It is in this way: that if the customers came in and said "I like that chair," and it did not happen to be one made by me, the buyer would say, "Do you think, Imlay, you can make it?" I would look at it and say, "No, I do not think I could;" but if I thought that I could make use of what might be called inferior labour, or that it would be good exercise for the boys, I might take the job; but that would never be given to me unless I accepted it.

7161. I understand that if there was an order to be executed, large or small, and it could be bought in from a piecemaster at a certain price, if the buyer came to you and asked you, you would refuse to make it if you had to reduce your customary rate of wages?
Yes.

7162. You

7162. You would not allow yourself to be beat down by the price at which it was being made outside?
No.

7163. I think you told us that so far as you are aware dropping time is unusual?
Very unusual.

7164. You would not know whether there were 10 or 15 men dropping time in your department?
Yes, I could tell.

7165. Would you say there were as many as 10 or 15?
No.

7166. How many would you say?
Perhaps two or three.

7167. Would it be possible, or impossible, to have the rate of wages and the amount of work required posted up, so that every man should know exactly what it was?
It would not be impossible.

7168. Do not you think that would avoid misunderstandings and difficulties?
I think it would.

7169. You think that would be a good plan?
Yes, I think it would.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

CHARLES PIPER, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

7170. *Chairman.*] WHAT is your position in the firm of Messrs. Maple?
Upholsterer.

7171. Are you a sub-foreman?
No.

7172. You are a journeyman?
Yes.

7173. Have you heard the evidence of Mr. Imlay?
I have heard the evidence.

7174. Do you agree generally to what he has said?
Yes.

7175. Have you anything particular you wish to add?
I wish to refer to Mr. Baum's evidence at No. 3067.

7176. Has it been already referred to?
I think not.

7177. What have you to say about it?
He stated that the man that altered the couch lost three days. It is false.

7178. How do you know?
Because I did it.

7179. Lord *Rothschild.*] Did you help to make that couch?
I did.

7180. *Chairman.*] This is what Mr. Baum said at page 509, Question 5203: "I wish to correct my reply to Question 3067. I was asked to give a typical case

case as to loss of time incurred by workmen not being paid for the time in the alteration of work caused by no fault of their own. I gave a typical case of a couch made for Her Majesty. I find that instead of its being three days which the workmen lost, one day was the time that he lost upon that particular job," is that correct?

I never lost any time. I always was paid my money every week.

7181. But is that correct?
No.

7182. You did not lose any time over that job?
No.

7183. Have you ever dropped time?
No; I have always been paid my money every week since I have been there, full money.

7184. But what the Committee have understood by dropping time is working more than the 53½ hours without getting more pay for it?
But that is when you made overtime.

7185. You call that making overtime?
Yes, and you are paid for it.

7186. But I am talking about when you are not paid for it; is not that what is generally called "dropping time"?
I do not know about dropping time. I have not dropped any. I cannot answer for other people.

7187. Earl of *Onslow.*] How do you know that Mr. Baum was referring to you?
He referred to the man who had done the job.

7188. And you are sure that that was the job?
There have only been two done; that was the last one, and I have done it.

7189. Are you a member of the London Society of Upholsterers?
No.

7190. Then if Mr. Baum was speaking of you as a member of his society, that would not have been correct?
He is not correct in saying that I had lost any time.

7191. And you are not a member of his society?
No.

7192. Therefore, if he is alluding to you, he is not alluding to a member of his society?
No; he was alluding to the man who had done it, not to anyone else.

7193. *Chairman.*] What he says is: "An order was given by Her Majesty, I believe, for a couch and lounge; it was repeated on the firm. A second was to be made like it, and by some fault or other of the salesman the instruction was not conveyed to the workman how the second one was to be done, and he did it on a plan which he used to do, and which turned out to be wrong when finished." Do you say you are the man who made that second couch or lounge?
Yes.

7194. Lord *Sandhurst.*] How many years have you worked for Mr. Maple?
Just over seven.

7195. And what wages do you get now?
£. 2. 6 *s.* 3 *d.*

7196. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] What is the practice of Messrs. Maple, so far as you know, if by some fault, for instance, an accidental omission on the part of the

the salesman, or any other person not connected with the actual formation of the goods, what is the practice, some loss occurs?
You alter it, and you are not at loss.

7197. You are paid for the time it takes you?
You are paid for the time you are at work.

7198. Does the system we have heard described give general satisfaction to the workmen?
Yes; it is correct what the Witness says, up and down and on again amongst us, that is all the same as amongst other men; we must have a shake up now and then to enliven us up.

7199. The men understand that?
Yes, they get it everywhere.

7200. That implies that people must exert themselves, I suppose, if they are to earn the money?
I do not see that.

7201. That is quite right, is it not, that they should exert themselves? I am referring to the remark made by one witness that under the present system men have to take their collars and waistcoats off in order to do the work?
I do not; I cannot answer for other people.

7202. *Chairman.*] What are your hours of work?
Fifty-three and a half hours a week.

7203. I mean what time do you begin in the morning, and what time do you leave off?
Eight o'clock in the morning till 7 o'clock at night; an hour for dinner, half hour for tea, 10 minutes for lunch.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

GEORGE BAILEY, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

7204. *Chairman.*] HAVE you anything to add to what was said by Mr. Imlay and Mr. Piper?
No, I can only say that they have always treated me in a proper manner.

7205. What is your position at Messrs. Maple's?
An upholsterer.

7206. You are in the upholstery department?
Yes.

7207. What is your position in the department?
I suppose I should be called about one of the first men.

7208. Would you be called a sub-foreman?
No; I believe I am to be raised to that position; I might say that.

7209. Still you are not that?
In the coming week I am to be. I mention it in case there might be some loophole.

7210. All you have to say is that you are quite satisfied?
Quite satisfied.

7211. Lord *Rothschild.*] Notwithstanding occasional swearing?
Mr. Imlay very seldom swore at me.

7212. Lord *Sandhurst.*] Have you been apprenticed?
No.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. HORACE REGNART, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

7213. *Chairman.*] You are one of the junior partners in the firm of Messrs. Maple and Company?
I am.

7214. Does the bought-in work go through your hands?
A great deal of it.

7215. What is the special department that is under your charge?
I have given my particular attention for this last 20 years to bedroom furniture and manufacturing of bedding. This last 10 years I have also given close attention to dining-room, drawing-room, and library furniture.

7216. Then in that class of goods, all the work that is put out or bought in, I suppose, would pass under your supervision?
Most of it.

7217. Who else would have to do with it?
I have buyers who surround me when I am passing goods, and deputies who have not had quite the experience that I have had.

7218. But you are responsible?
I am responsible; I pass the invoices.

7219. Do you take any steps to find out whether the manufacturers who take your put out work, in their turn put it out, sub-contract it?
I know of no makers that I deal with who do that.

7220. Do you take any steps to find out?
I am frequently in the shops. The men that I buy of make their own stuff with the men there before your eyes in their own shops.

7221. The Committee understood from Mr. Blundell Maple that the firm buy from very large numbers of people?
A good many; yes, we do; but we buy of people who work for us year after year, who have been working for us for 25 years.

7222. And to your belief they manufacture all the work on their own premises?
Certainly.

7223. But you cannot, I presume, be in a position to be certain about that?
Yes, I can.

7224. Should I be correct in saying that your responsibility in the matter consists in getting a satisfactory article?
Yes; value for money.

7225. Getting proper value for the money?
Yes.

7226. But beyond that, you cannot be certain that this work may not be put out?
I do not believe that it is so; there may be a case, and I not know it.

7227. Is it the case to your knowledge that these manufacturers have sub-contractors on their own premises; that these men who take the work for you have sub-contractors——?
Take what work?

7228. This work you put out to be made; furniture, or whatever it may be?
We do not put it out to be made.

7229. I mean

7229. I mean buy it in?
We buy it in.

7230. I think the other expression, "put out" was used by Mr. Maple; but I will say, the work you buy in; to your knowledge, are these people from whom you buy in work, any of them, practically, merely agents, and have they practical men on their premises to whom they sub-contract the order they get from you?
No; these men are makers, and they work with the men in making. When the job is done they bring it in; if that job is all right, I pass it, and give them their money.

7231. When you say you buy it in (you object to the term I used, "putting it out"); I suppose you first of all say what you want executed?
That is if we buy for order.

7232. You get some large order and then you invite a tender to make this order?
No; because one man will be a good man at making a wardrobe, and he could not make a chest of drawers even if you paid him double what it was worth; it would not be in his line.

7233. What is the process if you have a large order to execute?
If I have a large order I should know what goods to give to one man and what to give to another. One man can make one article of furniture all right and another he could not.

7234. How do you select among these many hundreds of men who execute these orders for your firm?
My experience tells me which is the right man to give the right order to. You can only gain that knowledge by experience.

7235. Therefore you mean that these men are not in competition one with another?
Very rarely.

7236. Within your knowledge do these manufacturers; do you call them manufacturers or piecemasters?
Makers we call them.

7237. Do these makers sub-let their orders to their foremen?
No, I never hear of it.

7238. You never heard of that?
No.

7239. If it came to your knowledge would you cease to deal with that maker?
We should not deal with him; we should be paying two profits then; we only want to pay one.

7240. Do you employ any makers in the East-end; the Bethnal Green and Curtain-road district?
I have got some makers who live down there that make for me; very few; they are not in Bethnal Green.

7241. Where are they?
I have some working for me round Finsbury.

7242. Is Finsbury in the Bethnal Green district?
No, I should think not, it is a good mile from there. I have not been in Bethnal Green for this seven or eight years.

7243. You have nobody working for you, or taking work from you, in Bethnal Green or Curtain-road?
No, I do not know of any. Years ago we bought in the Curtain-road; we do not buy there now.

7244. When you say you do not know any, it could not happen without your knowledge, I suppose?

I should not think so. There is such a thing as a stray man living in that locality coming and offering goods; we should not buy of him, but occasionally, very rarely, it might happen.

7245. I suppose practically you buy the goods merely in the way of business; it is not your business to know how they are made, or where they are made?

We do not take in anything; they must be made right or else we should not have them.

7246. I do not mean "how they are made" in that way, but under what circumstances?

But most of the people we buy of make for us regularly, and we know all about them; see the goods being made, and are often in their shops.

7247. Earl of *Limerick.*] Some people whom you do not regularly employ sometimes bring goods and you take them?

That is done in the trade; years ago it was more done by us, but it is not done by us now; very rarely.

7248. *Chairman.*] I want to draw your attention to the answer to Question 2862, at page 279, in the evidence of Mr. William Parnell. He says, "I know of a case in which work has been obtained by a large firm and given out to a sub-contractor." I suppose by "sub-contractor" he would mean what you call a maker?

A maker, I should say.

7249. "Who has given it out to another sub-contractor, who has given it out again to a man supposed to be his foreman, and the foreman has then given it out as piecework to the workmen"?

I do not know any such case.

7250. I want to ask you whether such a case as that could occur in your business?

Not in our firm.

7251. How could you avoid its occurring?

I am sure to know, because I know the ins-and-outs, and how everything is made. He may be referring to the firm he represents.

7252. He does not mention any name?

I see he does not.

7253. I want to know by what means in your power could you possibly tell if one of these makers gave out the work to another sub-contractor, who again gave it out to a man who was his foreman, who again gave it out as piecework to the workmen?

I never heard of such a case. It could not occur with us, because when we give out a large order we are continually looking after it, and see how they are getting on with it.

7254. Do you mean that the buyers go round?

Yes; if it were a large order I should go myself.

7255. And see the work in the course of being made?

Yes.

7256. I will call your attention to some evidence given by Mr. Arnold White at page 210, No. 2135. He says, "Now, as an instance, and as a specific statement on the question of sub-contracting, I am informed, taking one of the largest houses in the trade, that Maple employs Gifford and Ley; Gifford and Ley employ Phemister, and a boy worked for Phemister"; is that correct?

I inquired into that case. Gifford and Ley explained to me that his workshops are verymuch smaller than they should be for the trade he is doing, and that

that he had given this work out into another shop, and that Phemister was working for him at so much wage per week, I believe he told me 9 *d.* an hour he paid him. He was pressed at that particular time, he explained to me, for room; being very busy, he took this shop, and put this man in there; all the wood came from Gifford and Ley's premises, and was made up by this man Phemister at so much per hour, and he paid him his wages at the end of the week.

7257. At so much an hour; not at so much for the job?
Ninepence an hour, I believe he told me he was paying him.

7258. As I understand you, so far as the bought-in work is concerned, you generally employ the same makers, and you constantly visit their premises if a large order is going on?
Yes.

7259. And to the best of your belief, having that means of knowledge at your disposal, you think that the work is executed on their own premises?
Yes.

7260. And cannot be sub-contracted?
No doubt of it.

7261. That is to the best of your belief?
That is the best of my belief.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Lunæ, 9° *Julii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord ARCHBISHOP of CANTERBURY.
Earl of DERBY.
Earl of ONSLOW.
Lord CLINTON.
Lord CLIFFORD OF CHUDLEIGH.
Lord FOXFORD (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord MONKSWELL.

LORD KENRY (EARL OF DUNRAVEN AND MOUNT-EARL), IN THE CHAIR.

MR. HORACE REGNART, having been called in; is further Examined, as follows:

7262. *Chairman.*] I WANT to ask you a question or two about these two invoices; would you look at them for a moment?
The Witness looks at the invoices, and explains to his Lordship in detail, at the Committee table, the various entries and marks on them.

7263. I understand that this first paper I showed you is an invoice of Mr. Van Damme's; the amount being 19 *l.*?
Yes.

7264. £. 2 being taken off for some cause or another?
There would be a reason for the 2 *l.* being taken off. Mr. Adams could be produced and explain it.

7265. £. 2 being taken off for some reason or other not shown on the invoice; that reduces the amount to 17 *l.*?
Yes.

7266. Two and a-half per cent. taken off as discount reduces the total to 16 *l.* 11 *s.* 6 *d.*?
Yes.

7267. Then you have the initials of the buyer as well?
Yes; that is Mr. Adams, the buyer, who passes the account; the money cannot be obtained till that signature is there.

7268. And that person is the person who made the reduction from 19 *l.* to 17 *l.*?
That is the person.

7269. Now, would you see if you can find a statement of Van Damme's?
That is a statement (*producing it*). Anything more than one invoice would be a statement.

7270. Perhaps you would just explain this statement to me?
The Witness explains it to his Lordship at the Committee table.

7271. This is a statement consisting of three invoices; or, rather, two invoices, one of them containing two transactions?
That is so.

7272. The first invoice appears to be for the amount of 6 *l.* 10 *s.*, and he appears to have received for that 7 *l.* 10 *s.*?

He would probably have taken the order for 6 *l.* 10 *s.*, and then, when the article came in, we should consider it to be worth 7 *l.* 10 *s.*, and give him 1 *l.* more. (*The Witness gives some other explanations at the Committee table.*)

7273. Those are added up here in a statement, and the 2½ per cent. is taken off from the total amount?

Yes, from the total amount.

7274. Those have not been through your hands?

Yes; my signature is attached to one or two of those.

7275. These particular ones that I was showing you, have they been through your hands; if so, perhaps you will show me where your signature is. Do they all go through your hands?

Not everyone; Mr. Adams takes half, and I take half. These amounts are paid on a Friday, unless the goods are brought in on a Saturday; if a man is late and behind-hand, he is paid on a Saturday; but there are few accounts like that. I devote all Thursday to passing invoices; and on a Friday afternoon it takes me all the afternoon, and has done for years and years, to pass these statements; and then these statements are sent up to the counting-house, and the counting-house take off the discount; and in the evening the men call between five and seven o'clock and receive their cheques. Any Friday evening you can see 200 or 300 people standing, waiting for their cheques.

7276. All these statements and invoices go either through your hands or Mr. Adams's?

Yes; that is a signature of mine (*pointing to a signature*). I always sign with a blue pencil.

7277. If a reduction has to be made for any cause, is it always made on the invoice?

On the invoice.

7278. No reduction is ever made upon the statement?

I do not know about "never"; it ought not to be, but it ought to be on the invoice; else you could not show where the deduction was taken from.

7279. Then, if there was anything to be taken off for bad work or any other cause, it would be made on the invoice?

On the invoice. It frequently occurs that a maker will bring in a thing faulty; then, of course, you are not foolish enough to pay the full price for a faulty article.

7280. Is it not the general custom, if the work is faulty, to send it back to the manufacturer?

Sometimes you send it back, and sometimes the man who brings the work in will elect to take less; he will ask, "If I charge you so and so, will that do for you?" it is a mutual arrangement between the buyer and the seller.

7281. You never mark upon the invoice or upon the statement what the reduction is made for?

No; we just term it "overcharge" or "allowance;" that is the general term that we use.

7282. Would the amount of the contra-account be taken off on the invoice or the statement?

It would be taken off at the bottom of the statement.

7283. How would that appear on the statement?

It would say "contra," perhaps 5 *l.* it would be, for goods that he had purchased during the week; he would, for instance, probably buy timber, brass work, and so on.

7284. It

7284. It would appear on the statement so much "contra"?
Yes; but then he is furnished with an invoice of what he buys as well.

7285. Of course; I only want to know how it would appear on the statement?
That is the way it would appear.

7286. What is the difference between overcharge and discount?
Discount is a discount that is allowed you when you begin an account with a man. Supposing I was to open an account with a man to-day, I should say, "What are your terms?" "Five per cent.," he might say; another man might say, "Two and a half per cent." Very well; we understand that if we do business together, your discount is 5 per cent;" and that is an arranged thing, and made a note of at the time.

7287. I suppose that accounts for the fact that we have sometimes heard 5 per cent. and sometimes $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. spoken of the discount?
Yes; and I do a great deal with my clients at net.

7288. What is the "overcharge?"
When a man is trying to charge an unfair charge. For instance, a man may bring in an article of furniture, and when he brings it in it may not be a good job, though he has undertaken to make it so; you would reduce it, and say, "You may take it away, or I will give you so much for it;" he has the option of leaving it or taking it away? if he leaves it, he leaves it at that reduction.

7289. Is that the only transaction to which the term "overcharge" would apply?
That is all.

7290. Then there may be several deductions made on a statement?
There may be.

7291. Deductions for overcharge; deduction for contra account?
That is not a deduction, that is a *bonâ fide* debt, you see; he has bought the goods of you, and owes the money.

7292. I mean that various sums may be taken off the total?
Yes. We settle with him weekly, and he settles with us.

7293. Various sums might be taken off the total for various reasons?
Yes; but we should give the reason why each amount was taken off.

7294. In some cases, but you do not in all cases; for instance, on this invoice just now referred to, there is 2 *l.* taken off as overcharge, and no reason assigned for it. The statement or the invoice would not show the cause of the overcharge; it would show the amount of it?
If it was taken off the invoice, there would be no occasion to take it off the statement.

7295. But if it was taken off the invoice, the reason would not show on it?
Overcharge, O.C., 2 *l.*, or whatever it was, would appear on the invoice.

7296. It would appear on the invoice "overcharge, so much"?
Yes.

7297. But it would not be stated on the statement or invoice what the reason why it was done?
No, we could not explain all that.

7298. Earl of *Limerick.*] The reason would be explained to the person at the time?
Yes, at the time of the settlement of the transaction.

7299. *Chairman.*] Then the method is this: A man brings in his invoice or invoices, and any reduction that has to be made is made upon them to his knowledge; the man has it explained to him?
While he is standing by his goods.

7300. Those several invoices are made up into a statement, and the statement is sent into the counting-house?
Yes.

7301. And the man calls and gets his cheque?
He posts his statement; they send the statement generally by post on Thursday night.

7302. Is any reduction ever made on the statement after it has passed out of the maker's hands, without his knowledge?
No, it cannot be.

7303. It could not be done?
No.

7304. According to some of the evidence before the Committee it would appear that when a man goes to get his cheque he does not know what the exact amount he is going to get is, and that he is surprised to find that the cheque is smaller, sometimes considerably smaller, than he expected, and then, if he complains, they show him the statement, and show him that the cheque corresponds with the amount on his statement; would that be possible?
No.

7305. When a man goes up to get his cheque he knows exactly what he is to receive?
Because he gets the statement into his hands before he gets the money.

7306. He gets the statement before he gets the cheque, and never the cheque before he gets the statement?
I will explain it more fully. When the man brings in his goods, he brings the invoice with his goods; then if there is any disagreement between me and the man it is done before him there and then on the invoice; so he knows there and then. Suppose it is on a Monday and he brings me in goods to the amount of 50 *l.*, and there is a disagreement between him and me about the finish of these goods to the tune of 50 *s.*, we will say for argument's sake, that is fought out between him and me at the time, and he agrees that my criticism of those goods is fair, and makes the allowance of 50 *s.*; then when he goes home (he does not make out his statement till Thursday), he sends in his statement, knowing that that deduction has been made on the invoice to the amount of 50 *s.*

7307. The maker makes out the statement himself, does he?
Certainly; we have got nothing to do with it; except that we do with one or two men who cannot read or write, and some of our junior clerks make it out for them as a favour, but 999 out of a 1,000 are sent by post.

7308. And the statement, I understand, would consist of the amount of the various invoices, minus the deductions, whatever they might be, which had been made between you and the maker from the invoice price?
At the time of delivery of the goods with the invoice.

7309. But the invoices do not all pass through your hands?
Not every one.

7310. Through your hands or Mr. Adams'?
Yes; they must pass through my hands at the end of the week.

7311. The invoice I first showed you does not contain your signature or Mr. Adams'?
No, it contains Mr. Dent's signature, who was the buyer of the particular department some three years ago (but he has left us now) so that his signature was valid at that time; but after he had passed the invoice I passed the statement.

7312. How many persons are competent to pass an invoice at the present time; how many buyers?

A buyer

A buyer to each department, and I suppose we have got 25 or 30 of them.

7313. Then 25 or 30 persons are competent to pass an invoice?
Yes, to pass an invoice, but not a statement.

7314. Then the statement, consisting of a number of those invoices, has to go through your hands or Mr. Adams'?
Yes.

7315. If the invoice is not passed by yourself you do not examine the goods?
No; the man who passes the goods signs the invoice.

7316. Then might you not take exception to these goods afterwards?
If there is any dispute between this buyer and this maker it would be brought before me; but that is very rarely the case.

7317. I mean, if you had cause to be dissatisfied with the finish of the goods, and with the arrangement which one of these 25 or 30 buyers had made, would you make a further reduction if necessary upon the statement?
No.

7318. You would consider yourself bound by the arrangement made by the buyer?
We have confidence in the judgment of our buyer, else we should not appoint him.

7319. You would consider yourself bound by him?
Yes, because he would understand his business and know what he was about.

7320. You would not make any further reduction beyond that made by the buyer?
I have arbitrated occasionally, but very rarely indeed, between the buyer and the maker; and I have sometimes decided in favour of the maker, and sometimes gone against him.

7321. That is not quite what I mean; what I want to get at from you is whether, after the matter is arranged between the buyer and the maker as shown upon the invoice, if you or Mr. Adams were dissatisfied with the goods and with the arrangement the buyer has made, you would make any further reduction which would appear upon the statement, but not upon the invoice?
No, I never remember doing such a thing.

7322. When a man requires cash for his cheque, does he ever apply to you or mention the fact to you?
He gets it through my signature.

7323. And you have to give him an order to get cash?
Yes. A man will sometimes come to me on Tuesday, though his money will not be due till Friday, and he will say, "I have a payment to meet on Thursday; can you let me have 100 *l.*?" I give him the 100 *l.* directly, and then on the following Friday, when his account is settled, that is taken off; but we never charge interest for it.

7324. Do you charge interest for cashing cheques?
Never; I never heard of such a thing?

7325. Do you think it is possible that, owing to the invoice and the statement containing no reason for deductions that are made upon them, a man getting cash for his cheque might consider that the overcharge was made for cashing his cheque?
I do not see how he could think it in that way, because he would know what the overcharge was for when he brought the goods in.

7326. You have read the evidence, have you not?
I have read a good deal of it.

7327. I want to ask you some questions upon the alleged transactions with Mr. Miller. Had you transactions personally with Miller?

Ninety per cent. of my transactions with Miller were done through a man named Fisher.

7328. Has Miller ever complained to you about discount or overcharge being taken off his statement?

No.

7329. Then I suppose Mr. Miller is not correct in saying, in answer to Question 2359, that if he were sent down to Mr. Regnart "he would keep you two or three hours waiting, and so in nine cases out of ten you had to submit"?

No, that would not be true.

7330. I will call your attention to page 447, to what Mr. Richards says; will you look at No. 4568; the question is: "I think you mentioned in evidence that you found that a discount, to the extent sometimes of 5 and sometimes of 10 per cent., was taken off?" and the answer is: "I meant that invoices were all going in with these lots of goods; and perhaps Mr. Regnart would ask someone else what he would make my suite for. 'I would make it for so much,' he would say; then he would immediately go and take it off my invoice"; is that possible?

No, it is not true. I bought of this man altogether 21,615 *l.* 6 *s.* 1 *d.* worth of goods; the overcharge amounted to 193 *l.* 0 *s.* 4 *d.* during a period of eight years; we paid him 209 *l.* 8 *s.* strictly net; we had 5 per cent. off 2,041 *l.* 0 *s.* 6 *d.*; we had 2½ per cent. off 19,171 *l.* 17 *s.* 3 *d.* The whole of the discount, with the overcharges, altogether is equivalent to 3½ per cent. and a fraction on the whole account.

7331. Supposing you had arranged with a maker to make an article for a certain price, say 50 *l.*, and you subsequently found that you could get it made for 45 *l.*, you would not take 5 *l.* off him?

No, we should give him the 50 *l.*, and the next time we wanted it we should go and buy it for 45 *l.*, if we could get the same value for it exactly. But this man, Richards, had very good prices given to him, and he worked for everybody else at the same time he was working for us; and he also worked for two years after he complained about us copying his design.

7332. I will read to you what Mr. Maple said in answer to Question 5560 on page 584. Mr. Maple is speaking about Mr. Miller's evidence, and he says: "Those discounts are for cash off the prices that he was in the habit of selling at, not only to us but to other firms, and you will see that his statement is perfectly untruthful again; for the biggest discount that he ever allowed for cash, was on one occasion when, I believe, he allowed 15 per cent., which was 10 per cent. over his usual discount, and that was for a particular transaction. He wanted to clear a large stock, and my buyer did not require them, and after he had been all round to the other people with whom he did business, and (as Fisher will explain to you) had offered them nearly, if not quite the same terms as he offered to us, he came to Mr. Regnart, and offered him 15 per cent., and Mr. Regnart purchased these things from Miller. So that you will see that these statements that are made here by Miller as to 20 per cent., and these sort of discounts being extracted from him, are perfectly erroneous and perfectly untrue." What I wanted to find out from you in reference to that was whether this amount of 10 per cent. being taken off, and Miller asserting that he considered it was taken off for cashing his cheques, it might not be possible that he could make a mistake of that kind?

No, he could not make that mistake at all.

7333. He having, I understand, first to get your order to get cash?

He had to get my order before he could get a penny; and that is quite a false statement, and he knew it.

7334. You mean to say he had to get your order to get his cheque cashed, and if he had 10 per cent, or 15 per cent. taken off he would know so well what it

it was taken off for, that he could not possibly be right in thinking that the discount of 15 per cent. was taken off for giving him cash?

The 15 per cent. would probably be taken off on Monday or Tuesday, and he would get his cash at the end of the week; that would be the agreement between him and me when I bought goods on the Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday.

7335. Before you knew he would require cash?

He knew he would not get his money till the Friday or Saturday.

7336. Before you knew he would require cash?

I knew he would require cash every week. I used to arrange to buy these goods of him sometimes before they were quite finished; I would buy them on the Monday or Tuesday, and he would say, "I will deliver them on the Friday," but invariably he had not got them done on the Friday, and the consequence was that they were delivered on the Saturday. He makes out it was our fault he did not get the cheque till the Saturday; but it was the contrary.

7337. The usual custom, I understand you, is to give the cheques on the Friday?

Yes.

7338. But if the goods are brought in on Saturday the cheque may be given on Saturday?

It is a favour to that man.

7339. Is it the custom to give written orders or verbal orders?

I have bought goods thousands and thousands of times by written orders, and I have given a large number of verbal orders; it depends on who we are dealing with, and whether we have confidence in them and they in us. I have often given an order for 10,000 *l.* by word of mouth, and should think nothing of it. But they can always have a printed order; we use hundreds of books with a fly-leaf, and there are seven or eight clerks who have nothing to do but write out these orders.

7340. Lord *Clinton.*] We could see these books, I suppose?

I could bring them down; I had looked out some to bring down this morning.

7341. Have you the counterfoils?

Yes.

7342. We could see them?

Yes; we keep them for about two years, and after that we sell them.

7343. *Chairman.*] Would you look at Question 5888, on page 594; it is in Mr. Maple's evidence. He was speaking on the subject of written orders, and he says: "Our firm is always very happy to write any orders, and we have order forms; but if men do not think to ask for them, and the salesman has to go round to his office, 100 yards or 200 yards off, to write out the order form, and it is not required, it is not given; but whenever they are asked for, orders are always given, and we have order books regularly." If the salesman required frequently to go out of his way 100 yards or 200 yards off, would not that take up a great deal of time, and would not a maker, insisting upon written orders and occupying the salesman's time in that way, necessarily be at a disadvantage as compared with men content with a verbal order?

No, because all the tradesmen who call for orders come to a particular room, and there they stop; and if a certain salesman is wanted, he is sent for, and that salesman comes out, and there is a desk there all the order books are.

7344. Is Mr. Maple not correct in saying that the salesman would have to go 200 yards?

The salesman might be 500 yards away; he often is, for the show-rooms are so extensive; you have to go and find the salesman; but there is an attendant

to wait upon the tradesmen who call for orders. In this particular room where they call there is the buyer, there is the deputy, and another assistant, and five or six clerks; and they are always in this room. The salesman might be on third floor serving a customer; naturally he would have to be fetched.

7345. If a man caused a salesman to be fetched down when he was 200, 300, 400, or perhaps 500 yards off, if A. did that, and B. did not bother about getting a written order, would not B. be more likely to get a written order?
No; the salesman does not write the order himself; the buyer gives it out.

7346. Then what has the salesman got to do with it?
Very little indeed; only to put it into a book, to say what he wants.

7347. He has to write out the order form, has he not?
No; the clerk does that.

7348. Mr. Maple says that the salesman does?
That is a mistake.

7349. All I want to know from you is whether the maker who fetches the salesman down——?
No, the maker does not fetch the salesman down.

7350. The salesman has to come down, in consequence of his requiring a written order?
Very rarely; not once in six months; because that is entered in a book overnight, before the tradesman comes.

7351. I understood that if two makers come, one A. and the other B., and if A. insists upon having a written order, according to Mr. Maple's evidence, the salesman has to attend upon him; he has to be fetched to do something, possibly from a considerable distance?
That is a mistake.

7352. That is incorrect?
Yes.

7353. I understand from you, then, that getting a written order entails no inconvenience; creates no loss of time?
Not the least.

7354. So that a man getting a written order would not be at any disadvantage compared with a man taking one verbally?
Not the least.

7355. Earl of *Limerick.*] Would the tradesmen have, in any case, to see him if it were a verbal order?
Very rarely, if it is for a certain sized piece of furniture to be made.

7356. If it were a verbal order, I ask?
A verbal order would be given for a regular piece of furniture which was being sold all the year round.

7357. But the salesman would have to come to see it, would he not?
Not always; everyone would know what that particular pattern chair, we will say, was; for a series of years that has been sold, and if he sold that chair he would have a written order given.

7358. Then it would not be verbal in that case?
No; it would not be verbal. There are very few verbal orders given; but they are given, and can be given occasionally; but 95 per cent. of our orders are written orders with a fly leaf, and we keep a copy of them.

7359. *Chairman.*] You say 95 per cent. of them are written?
Yes.

7360. That

7360. That is contrary to Mr. Maple's evidence. At any rate you say that 95 per cent. of the orders are written orders?
Yes.

7361. As to these loans which have been spoken about, loans are made by the firm, are they not, to assist makers in putting up machinery?
We have done so, very rarely, not many of them.

7362. I will ask you some questions in the evidence of Mr. Miller on that subject. At Question No. 2327, Mr. Miller is speaking of his premises, and with regard to that he said: "I had to take these premises, and I had to pay a heavy rental for that; premises worth about 40 *l.* a year I had to pay 95 *l.* for." Then he is asked: "Where are your premises?" He answers: "They were in Southampton-buildings, Euston-street, Euston-road." Then the next question is: "You were charged rent for the premises?" And he replies: "The rent was deducted out of the cheque; Mr. Regnart used to claim the premises as his private property, but the rent was always deducted out of the account in the counting-house, by Maple." Did Mr. Miller rent these premises from you?
He rented them of me, Miller & Wicks the firm was; he came and asked me if I would let him the premises; and I referred him to my lawyer who had all the transactions; I told him what the rent was, and he took them through the lawyer; I had nothing to do with it.

7363. Is it correct that the rent was 95 *l.* a year?
It is, and very good value too.

7364. He further says that the rent was deducted out of his cheques?
Here is a cheque of Miller's which he never met for rent. (*Producing a cheque.*)

7365. I ask you the question, was the rent taken out of the cheque?
A man of the name of Edwards collects all my rents for me; and I believe that occasionally he has gone to the counting-house and said that when Miller received his money he wanted so much for rent; but that was very rarely. The cheques were generally paid through Fisher to this Edwards the collector.

7366. When Mr. Miller says: "Mr. Regnart used to claim the premises as his private property, but the rent was always deducted out of the account in the counting-house by Maple," you would say that was correct with the exception that it was not "always" deducted, but sometimes deducted?
Such a thing might have occurred twice probably, I should think; but as a rule the cheques were given by himself for his rent. I have one here that he never met; and here (*pointing to a document*) is a report as to the value of the premises. They are worth the money; there are premises next door let at 90 *l.* a year on one side, and, on the other side, at 100 *l.* a year, about the same sized premises; they have been let so for 12 years.

7367. The premises belong to you?
My own property, and have been for years.

7368. How do you account for the rent being taken out of the money received from the firm?
I knew nothing about it; my clerk had to do with that.

7369. Can you explain the transaction?
Only this way, that he would suggest to the collector "when I get my cheque at the end of the week, you can have your rent."

7370. Do you mean that the rent was to be taken out of the cheque or that the amount of the rent was deducted from the statement?
No, the cheque would be given over to him in full for his statement, and then he would pay the rent out of it at the time. But a witness named Fisher will be called before you who will be able to explain that; he had to do with it; I had nothing to do with that.

 7371. I understand

7371. I understand you that if the statement was for 100 *l.* Miller would get a cheque for that; but supposing that the rent was, we will say, 25 *l.*, that would be stopped out of the cash that he received for the cheque?
The firm would have nothing to do with it at all, he would pay it to my representative while he was on the premises.

7372. Earl of *Onslow.*] How could he get the cash?
I do not know. Occasionally, I believe, they have cashed the cheque at the counting-house to oblige him.

7373. *Chairman.*] Do many of the men who work for Messrs. Maple rent premises from you?
That is the only man.

7374. Earl of *Limerick.*] What is that statement you have produced as to the value of the premises?
The Witness Miller said the premises were only worth 40 *l.* a year; so I have had them valued.

7375. By whom?
By a firm of auctioneers.

7376. *Chairman.*] This money advanced for the machinery, I presume, was advanced by the firm?
Yes.

7377. But it would not appear in the books?
No.

7378. Did you ever advance any money personally to that man?
Not a farthing; I never have to anybody.

7379. And this loan to Miller was on the part of the firm?
We never lent him any money.

7380. Neither you nor the firm lent him anything?
No, never a farthing, excepting when in the week he has asked for 100 *l.* on account of goods, and that has been settled at the end of the week; and that is frequently done with all tradespeople.

7381. These loans that were lent, paid by the firm for the purpose of putting up machinery or any other purposes, would not appear in any of the books?
No, they would be lent on mortgage.

7382. Would the interest appear in the contra account?
No.

7383. How long have you been at Messrs. Maple's?
Thirty-two years.

7384. And you, I think you told us, exercise a general superintendence?
Yes.

7385. That is to say, you are well acquainted with the department that Mr. Imlay presides over?
I have had a good deal to do with it; I engaged Mr. Imlay, and formed the department.

7386. Do you approve of the development and changes he has made in the upholstery department?
Most decidedly.

7387. Is there more than one upholstery shop?
We have three.

7388. Where are they situated?
One is adjoining our own premises; one is in Mortimer Market, a few hundred yards from our place; and the other is in the Euston-road; they are our own properties.

7389. Have

7389. Have you got more than one cabinet shop, too?
Yes.

7390. How many?
We have got two in Tottenham Court-road, the back of Tottenham Court-road, and one at Islington.

7391. And does Mr. Imlay superintend the shops?
Only the upholstery shop.

7392. But does he superintend all the three upholstery shops?
There is a foreman in each, but he is the foreman of the lot; we should look to him.

7393. Are these various shops in competition one with the other?
No; they do different classes of work.

7394. None of them do the same class of work of the others?
Unless we are very busy and pushed, and then we should put the work into any shop we liked.

7395. But if one shop could make a certain class of goods cheaper than the others you would not compel the others to put the prices down to the same level?
Oh, no.

7396. And that would apply in the cabinet shops also?
Just the same. In the cabinet shops they are paid wages from 7 *d.* to 9 *d.* and 10 *d.* an hour.

7397. With regard to that pay-list of employés which Mr. Maple put in, does that include the hands in the factory at Islington?
Yes.

7398. It includes them all?
Yes, I believe it does, everything.

7399. Mr. Imlay has told us that he introduced these changes in order to compete with the middleman or piecemaster?
Yes.

7400. And that he found he could do so and save the profit made by the middleman?
Yes.

7401. Which profit, he said, went to the Wages Fund?
Yes.

7402. That is to say, I suppose, that by introducing the same system of working as is pursued by the piecemaster into your upholstering business, you succeeded in saving the profit, whatever it might be, that the piecemaster makes?
I do not know that the piecemaster's system is the same as ours; I do not think it is.

7403. What would be the difference?
I could not say; they do it their own way, you know.

7404. Do you think that subdivision of work into a great many more branches than formerly, tends to make men more dependent than they used to be?
They learn one branch thoroughly now; before, they had a smattering of five or six branches and did not know any properly.

7405. I asked you whether you think the greater sub-division of work makes them more dependent on their employers?
No, I do not think so. A man who leaves us can get employment directly, if he is a good upholsterer.

7406. Do you think that the system that you have perfected makes it more difficult for men to combine?
No, I should not think so.

7407. I can understand that where work is done by piecework, men might combine among themselves to settle what remuneration should be given for a certain amount of work; and I understand also that if they were working entirely by time, they might combine among themselves as to the rate of wages; but under your system, which is a combination of the two, as I understand it, and where one checks the other, I should think it would be more difficult for the men to combine. I do not say whether it would be a good thing or a bad thing if they could combine; but it would be more difficult for them to do so, would it not?
I do not think our men ever want to combine; they always have plenty of work year after year, and they appear to me to be satisfied.

7408. I was asking you whether you think it would make combination more difficult?
I think they could combine all the same, if they chose.

7409. Have you had many complaints; do you think there has been much dissatisfaction, either amongst the makers who make for you or amongst your employés; I mean the artizans?
Very rarely. Some ten years ago we had more trouble with the upholsterers, because we were full of society men. We have not so many now, so we go on very much better.

7410. Was there not a strike four or five years ago?
No, it is more than that. It was not a strike; they wanted to have the upper hand, and I turned them all out.

7411. I thought it was in 1881?
It would be seven or eight years ago.

7412. It was not a strike?
No.

7413. You turned the men out, you say?
We turned them out and got a fresh lot.

7414. As I understood Mr. Imlay (I want to know if I am right) he, or whoever is the head of the department, settles the remuneration of labour in a more or less despotic and arbitrary manner; that is to say, he decides by what the man does as to what his rate of wages should be, and he also decides how much work the man should be able to turn out in a given time. I will assume that that arrangement is perfectly just, and right, and fair; still, it is somewhat of a despotic character, is it not?
No. I do not see anything despotic about it; because, generally, a consultation takes place between the workman and the foreman and the deputy foreman, and it is mutually agreed that a certain job is worth so much money, and that if it is worth so much money it ought to be done in such and such a time.

7415. Do you mean that he arrives at it in the way of an agreement with the men?
With the shop certainly. If we were to try and drive hard bargains with those men, we should not keep them; they would all turn out. We have no hard bargains in our shop at all.

7416. Do you know at all how many men go and come in the year?
I have brought a note for your Lordship about that. I think it is 16 who left us in the last year, something about that; and often at this time of the year a man will want to have fresh air, and he will go and work in some seaside town for a month or two and come back in the winter; he will leave us for the summer.

7417. Lord

7417. Lord *Clinton.*] 16 out of the whole number, do you mean?
Out of the upholstery department; these three shops that we have spoken of.

7418. *Chairman.*] Will you read out your statement?
"During the year 1887, 12 men from the stuffing department left from various causes, whose wages were over 36 *s.* per week, and eight new men came during the same time whose wages exceeded 36 *s.* per week to commence with. The constant increase in wages earned by others has more than filled the other vacancies; in fact I should say the 12 have been replaced by 16 or 18." That is the foreman's report.

7419. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] You mean that the places of the men who left were filled by other men in the shop who were promoted?
Yes.

7420. *Chairman.*] What happens if you find that these makers outside can produce cheaper than you can on your own premises?
But that has not happened yet; we shall know how to tackle it when it does happen.

7421. Do not you have to reduce your cost of production as compared with theirs?
No; the way we buy it is impossible for them to beat us.

7422. You can manufacture as cheaply as they can?
Yes.

7423. And I suppose they are always trying to manufacture cheaper than you can?
I suppose they are.

7424. Has the cost of production diminished greatly in the last 10 years?
The cost of materials is reduced so in price.

7425. The total cost of production has decreased?
Yes, it has decreased. Take beech; that is largely used in chair frame making.

7426. Is the diminished cost of production entirely caused by cheap material?
Yes. I should say that all upholsterers earn better wages than they did 10 years ago.

7427. You think that the entire reduction is due to cheaper materials?
Yes, everything is reduced; a considerable reduction in the cost of material in our business from top to bottom.

7428. Earl of *Onslow.*] What arrangements do you make with a man who works for you; do you take goods from him that he makes for stock, or do you only take those that you order?
I do not quite follow your Lordship's question.

7429. Do you buy goods from a man which he makes for stock, or do you only buy those which he makes to your order?
We buy either way.

7430. Supposing you are not in a condition to give a man orders, or to buy the stock which he makes, what can he do with his labour and with the labour of his employés?
A man will occasionally come to me and say that he has got some stock on hand. Then I would say, "What is it?" "So-and-so." Probably he would have a list in his hand. I would make an appointment to go and see that stock, and I go through it item by item. "What do you want for it?" "I want so-and-so; but as I have got these on hand (I have made them while things are flat), I will take 10 per cent. off. With some makers it would be only 5 per cent., depending on what class of maker it is. I would say, "Well, I will give you so much," and strike a bargain with him; and he would say, "All right," and when those goods came in he would get his cheque.

7431. Would you do that in every case of a man working for you if you were ot able to give him order work?
No.

7432. In a case where a man brings goods to you, and you mark an overcharge, supposing he has bought his materials of you, and that he declines to take the price which you offer him, what is he to do: how can he pay you then for his materials, or pay his workmen?
But there is a standard value for everything that that man makes if he makes his goods up to the quality.

7432.* That is up to what you judge to be the quality?
I flatter myself that I am a judge of that.

7433. There is no appeal from your decision?
Yes, there is; he can go to Mr. Maple if he likes; he is always to be got at.

7434. There is no appeal from the firm?
No; but he can take the goods away if he is not satisfied.

7435. But if he does not do that he has to take what you offer him for them?
We should offer him a fair price. You might order a piece of furniture to have the drawers mahogany inside, and when they brought them in they might be deal; you would not pay the same price for deal as for mahogany. You might order a lever lock, and they might put on a common lock.

7436. But, on the other hand, the drawers might, in the opinion of the maker, run easily and be well made, and in your opinion they might not; in such a case you would make an "overcharge," I suppose?
If the goods are up to sample there is never any overchage made, if they keep up to quality.

7437. Can you tell us what is the history, and what is the advantages of this system of discount?
That went on before I was in the trade; it goes on everywhere.

7438. What is the advantage of it; why should you have it at all; why should not all your transactions be net?
There is no advantage in it, because it is all reckoned beforehand; they know very well that the discount is 2½ per cent. With every house all over the City of London there is a discount; if you pay prompt on the 10th of the month, 2½; and if you pay before that, you get 3 per cent.; an extra half per cent. All these big wholesale houses get it; everybody gets it.

7439. Supposing a firm was in difficulties, and could not pay the makers for, say three months; would they then pay them the full amount net without discount. I want to get at what is the object of this discount?
It is a custom of the trade; that is the best answer I could make to you.

7440. A mere custom of the trade for which there is no justification?
It has been in existence for 100 years I should think, and more than that.

7441. Is there any justification for it besides its antiquity?
Not the least. I would just as lief buy net as at a discount. I buy thousands of pounds worth net.

7442. You said, and Mr. Maple said, that he or some other member of the firm was always accessible to any person who had a complaint to make?
Yes.

7443. Then the statement that it is impossible to get any satisfaction by going to the firm, and that the persons complaining are always referred back again to Mr. Regnart is not true?
That is not true.

7444. You

7444. You have never known such a thing happen?
Never.

7445. Have you any system of private accounts between yourself and Messrs. Maple with regard to the indebtedness to you of the employés of Messrs. Maple?
No.

7446. You have no system by which payments due to the employés can be attached for debts to you as a private individual?
They never owe me anything.

7447. They sometimes owe you rent apparently?
Only this one transaction that has been mentioned, and that has never been collected by me, but by the collector.

7448. That is to say by your agent?
Yes.

7449. You say unless the cheque had been cashed on the premises and your collector had taken the actual cash from your tenant, it could not have been deducted out of the amount due to him?
No.

7750. And that would be your explanation of the transaction, if it took place?
Yes; I never received a farthing of rent all the time he was a tenant; the agent would have all to do with that.

7451. What is done by the agent is done by the principal. You were cognisant of what he did, were you not?
I knew he had to collect this rent; that is all I knew.

7452. You did not bother yourself as to how he collected it?
Not a bit.

7453. You said that Messrs. Maple never lent Miller any money?
No.

7454. Did you yourself?
Not a farthing?

7455. Then all this story of the loan of 100 *l.*, and 2 *l.* 10 *s.* being charged for it is a lie?
No doubt of it. But he borrowed 100 *l.* of his father, I am told, but a witness will come and tell you.

7456. But you or Messrs. Maple never lent him a farthing?
No, nor any other person I do business with. I have never lent a farthing.

7457. Mr. Elcock in his evidence at page 387, in answer to Question 3924, gives this evidence; he is speaking of Mr. Maple, senior (I asked Mr. Blundell Maple the same question, and he said that you could speak to it better than he could), and he says, "Mr. Maple, senior, has sent to me, and asked me to give him a price to make a sideboard; he has shown me one that has been made by someone else, and he has caught hold of me by the arm and has said, 'What can you make two sideboards like that for?'" Now is it the practice within your knowledge in the firm to take one man's pattern, and to get it made by another man?
No, but to give it to the man who makes the job in the first place.

7458. Do you always give him the offer first?
Yes.

7459. At the same pice as for the pattern?
At the same price as we bought it at. He is alluding there to a job sold the second time I expect.

7460. He says: "I have felt ashamed of myself in being made the tool of such people, to rob men of their designs, which had cost them much time and money." All that is absolutely untrue, is it?

That is all nonsense.

7461. Earl of *Derby*.] As to this practice of discount, do I understand that it is calculated upon a delay of three months in the payment being made?

No, we pay every week to all that class of tradespeople; but the larger accounts, such as Crossleys for carpets, and the bedstead manufacturers, we pay on the 10th of every month; 500 or 600 cheques will be drawn on the 9th, and they will reach their destination on the morning of the 10th, less 2½ per cent.; some 5 per cent.

7462. I understand that the nominal amount is so much, and the amount actually paid is 2½ per cent. less?

Yes.

7463 On what ground is that deduction of 2½ per cent. made?

It is a mutual contract between the buyer and seller. Suppose, for instance, I go and buy 5,000 bedsteads of a man; I have done it lately; he gave me a price for a hundred brass bedsteads; he said, "so much;" I said, "Suppose I make it a thousand?" He said, "Then I will give you so much; I said, "I will tell you what I will do; I will make it 5,000;" he said, "I will give you so much again; it will keep my men all going;" and I gave him an order for 5,000 brass bedsteads. That is a fair contract between me and the manufacturer.

7464. We do not dispute the fairness of it, but the question is, what is the advantage of fixing the nominal price, say 100 *l.*, and then making the real price, as is understood by both parties, 2½ per cent. less?

There always has been this 2½ per cent. discount.

7465. Earl of *Onslow*.] Nothing except the principle that whatever is best; that is the only justification you have for it?

That is all; the principle has been in existence for years and years.

7466. Earl of *Derby*.] There would be no disadvantage to your firm, or any firm, in giving up the practice and making the nominal sum and the real sum equal?

No disadvantage and no advantage, because it would be all reckoned in the transaction.

7467. Lord *Clinton*.] We understood Mr. Maple, that you gave a certain price for a sample, but that if a quantity of the same article is made after that sample, you would not give the same price for the quantity?

If you are given the price of one wardrobe and you order 40, you ought to be able to get the 40 made 10 per cent. cheaper than the one; and a good man would do that.

7468. But supposing that the tradesman who did the sample would not do the quantity, you would go to another tradesman who would do them after the first man had refused?

We should reason with that man and ask him if he would do them; and if he refused we should elect whether to let him go on with the lot.

7469. The other tradesman would have the advantage of the sample sent in by the first?

Not necessarily.

7470. That has been rather the complaint, that the second man has had the advantage?

The man named Richards said his price was 22 *l.* 15 *s.* for a wardrobe, and that we offered him 18 *l.* That is totally wrong, because here is the entry. The price of the wardrobe, he says, was 22 *l.* 15 *s.*——

7471. Did you pay him that for the sample?

Yes.

Yes. The price we paid was 19 *l.*, and 2 *l.* 10 *s.* for the glass; that is 21 *l.* 10 *s.* as against 22 *l.* 15 *s.* that he wished.

7472. But you gave it to the same man; is that what you mean?
We gave it to the man who made it, for 21 *l.* 10 *s.*

7473. What did you pay for the original design?
They both gave a price for the same thing.

7474. I was asking about a case where a man sent in an original design?
There is scarcely such a thing in the trade as an original design. This man Richards never had an original design; he copied from everyone else The furniture he alludes to in his evidence as being his own design, was first brought out by a man of the name of Martin. It was ash inlaid furniture, and had a certain run for a short time.

7475. But you think it could not happen in your trade that a man should make an original design and get a price for that sample, but that other people should get the advantage of the design, and get a quantity to make of that design?
We should not do that. If a maker makes a certain class of furniture, you cannot easily get another one to make the same class of furniture; men set themselves out to make a particular class of furniture.

7476. With regard to Mr. Imlay's system, I think you say there has been no complaint from the men about any unfairness of that system?
No; if there were I should be sure to hear of it.

7477. Do you happen to know about the length of time that men have served in that particular stuffing department?
For years.

7478. In that particular department, and it is the same thing in other departments?
Yes, it is the same thing all over our firm; men stay with us for years and years, and their children come and work for us; they marry and their children come and work for us.

7479. And the boys are apprenticed?
The boys are apprenticed.

7480. And then they get on in the same department?
Yes. Some have come as boys in apprenticeship, and then we have taken them into the warehouse and made salesmen of them, and they are doing well. Some do not turn out so well; you cannot always tell how they will turn out.

7481. Earl of *Limerick*]. Does the same systems of combined weekly wages and piece-work prevail in the cabinet department as well as in the upholstery department?
No.

7482. What is the system in the cabinet department?
Paying so much an hour.

7483. But is there no deduction in cases of work "dropped," as it has been called, in the cabinet department?
If a man did not do his work properly he would have to put it right in his own time; but that is very rarely the case.

7484. What is the difference between that and the system in the upholstery shop?
It is about the same thing.

7485. As regards what you have said about discount, you say that the discount varies according to the extent of the order?
Yes.

7486. For instance for 1,000 bedsteads the discount would be greater than would be the case if it were only 100?

Yes; the maker of bedsteads whould make a 1,000 much cheaper than he would 50.

7487. And that is understood?

That is understood.

7488. May the reason of not naming a net price for the 1,000, but doing it by way of discount, be that it is in order that the price of a single bedstead may be quoted at a certain sum?

When he first sends you in that particular bedstead he sends it in with the idea, probably, that he is only going to get an order for half-a-dozen.

7489. I mean this: You have got a single bedstead, and I will suppose you got it at a certain price; if you got 1,000 bedsteads and took a net price, instead of a price subject to a discount, the price of each individual bedstead would be much less?

So much less, certainly.

7490. But I suppose, as a matter of convenience, whether those bedsteads are got in small quantities or in large quantities, so long as they are all alike you like to quote them at one price?

You become associated with a thing. "What is the price?" he will say, "Five pounds, with 5 per cent. off." I will say, "Supposing I had a hundred of them, what will you then take off?" "I would take you off ten." The greater the quantity you can buy, the greater the discount you can get.

7491. I thought it might be that certain bedsteads were quoted say as "£.3 bedsteads," or "£.4 bedsteads;" that that was the designation by which the individual bedstead was known, and therefore, in getting large quantities, the original price was nominally kept, but that discount was allowed?

You take the discount from the original price.

7492. Still, you do not think that it practically signifies what discount is taken off, or whether the net price is quoted?

Not a bit. That alludes to the bedstead trade. Now take the wood trade: You would always get the 2½ per cent. for a thousand logs of wood for prompt payment; you buy so much cheaper. I have bought thousands of logs that way by the cube foot.

7493. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] You deal, I believe, with a large number of different firms?

We do.

7494. Could you give me any idea of about what would be the number of the men of the smaller class firms that you employ; some of them, of course, I understand, are big establishments; bnt some of them, I suppose, are comparatively small. Would you give me any idea of what was the size of the smaller ones?

We have not got very many small makers; not working for us.

7495. What would you call a small maker; a man with six men under him?

A man who worked himself, and with four or five men; and he works for us year after year.

7496. Then, until you come to the big firms, I suppose that there are not a large number of intermediate firms; men who have 15 under them?

Yes, 40. I have got a lot of men who work for me who have got 40 men; a good many.

7497. I suppose, if you buy a piece of furniture, if you stick it up anywhere there is not considered to be any very amount of copyright in the pattern?

No, there is no copyright.

7498. Practically,

7498. Practically, if I bought a piece of furniture it would be nothing unusual to get it re-copied by anybody I sent it to?

We have seven designers and three draughtsmen, and their aggregate salaries come to about 1,400 *l.* a year; and we often get new designs, and if we put them in the window they are copied within 24 hours. It is no uncommon thing to come to our window between one and two o'clock, when our men are having their meals, and there will be people with pen and pencil copying our designs; and it is done all over London, and the trade all know it.

7499. Lord *Monkswell.*] You say that the invoice is generally passed on Tuesday, and the goods are not sent in till Friday sometimes; may it not sometimes happen that when the goods are sent in they are not up to the mark?

Yes.

7500. And an overcharge has to be deducted at the last moment after the statement has been sent in?

No, the overcharge is taken off the invoice.

7501. I understood you to say that for the convenience of the men you sometimes go round and pass things before they are finished?

You could not pass things before they were finished; you go to see them, and agree to take them when they are finished at the end of the week?

7502. At such a price?

At such a price, but subject to their being finished properly; or else they might leave the brass work out, or the glass out of the doors. They are a class of men who want looking after.

7503. You say that a man sends in his statement by post on the Thursday, before he knows exactly what he has to receive?

No; he would not send his statement by post in that case because he would not have his goods finished.

7504. What would he do?

Bring it with him on the Friday or Saturday.

7505. That statement will contain his view of what he ought to receive, and not your view?

The statement will contain the amount of the invoice.

7506. But how would he get his invoice?

When he brings the goods in he brings the invoice with him.

7507. And then at the time you make out a statement?

No, he makes his statement out; we have nothing to do with it.

7508. But when does he bring the invoice to you?

When he brings his goods.

7509. On Friday evening?

If he brings the goods on the Tuesday he would bring the invoice.

7510. Suppose he takes the goods in on Friday, then after he has got the invoice signed by you, what happens; do you give him a statement?

No; the invoice then goes up to the counting-house.

7511. And there is no statement?

And then the statement he takes to the counting-house, and then there is another clerk who goes through all that and takes the discount off. I have nothing to do with it, only to attach my signature to the final amount. The clerk draws down the final amount; I have nothing to do with that.

7512. Even when it so happens that on Tuesday you give a man to understand that you will take his goods when they are finished, and he brings them on Friday evening, even in that case you say he always knows, or ought to know, before he goes to the cashier, exactly what he has to receive?

 Yes,

Yes, certainly, because he has sold me the goods and made the contract with me; he must know.

7513. You may take something off?
Only while he is there; if he did not choose to submit he would take the goods away.

7514. You have told us that you take a discount off the manufacturers when they make goods for you; do you take a corresponding discount off large orders for customers; supposing a customer orders a 1,000 bedsteads, would you take a larger discount off?
If you bought a thousand bedsteads from me, I should be very willing to make a special price; I do for hotels.

7515. And that would approximately be the same as the difference of the discount which you take off from your manufacturer's orders?
The two are different. The discount taken off the manufacturer's goods is always an arranged discount before he sells his goods; he knows what he is about; if there is any overcharge, it is because the goods are not up to quality.

7516. My only point was whether you dealt with your customers as you deal with your manufacturers?
We deal with our manufacturers fairly.

7517. *Chairman.*] Mr. Imlay told us the other day that there had lately been a rise of wages in his department; can you tell the Committee when that occurred?
I suppose that would be about five years ago; there was a new class of upholstery brought out.

7518. His answer is on page 700, at No. 7080. The question is: "Under that system, is there a separate rate of wages fixed for every individual, or do you pay so much to a man, according to the class of work he is in?" and the answer is: "According to the class of work and the ability. For instance, I may tell you that when I had a rather difficult class of work, I went down and told Mr. Blundell Maple that this work was rather difficult work to do, and I did not believe that the men could make such money as they had been earning. He said, 'What do you want?' I said, 'You ought to give them 10 per cent., I think, and he said, 'All right;' and that has never been taken off?
That is quite right.

7519. That occurred some five years ago, you say?
Yes.

7520. And there has been no rise since then?
No permanent rise in that way. Each job is decided on its own merits, for what it is worth. But I may tell you that that class of furniture has gone out of fashion; there is not so much of it being used.

7521. Mr. Imlay also told us that if a man was unable, say, in one week to turn out the requisite amount of work, he would try and make it up to him by giving him a lighter job of another kind?
Yes, a job that would pay better; some jobs are done quicker than others.

7522. That may be a very proper thing to do, but it is not in your opinion likely to cause misunderstanding among the men; they might think that one man was favoured and another not?
I do not think so. Take a very large centre ottoman; that takes a lot of doing; it is a very awkward piece of furniture to make up, and the man necessarily takes a longer time over it; and the next job you give him you give him one that is easier. It is mutually arranged; the men know all about it in the shop.

7523. And you practically settle the price of the articles that are brought in by

by the makers; that is to say, you have to decide whether the article is according to the sample, and is worth the amount?
I do.

7524. You arrange that with the maker?
With the maker at the time.

7525. But if he does not agree, his only alternative would be to take the goods back?
Yes.

7526. And then, unless he had a written contract, he would have no remedy at law?
He would more often have a written order than not.

7527. If he had no written order, he would have no remedy at law?
No, he would not.

7528. But you have told us that in 95 per cent. of the cases, it does not occur that there is not a written order?
Yes.

7529. Would you see any objection to having the names of these makers placed upon their goods?
I do not think it would answer at all.

7530. Why not?
Well, we should have all sorts of names all over our show rooms if every maker put his name on; besides, the man who brings the goods in does not make the goods himself.

7531. They are made in his shop?
They are made in his shop.

7532. He is the maker; what you call the manufacturer?
He is the maker; but has other men to work for him.

7533. How do you mean?
Take a maker that makes a sideboard; he would not make the whole of the sideboard; there are two or three of them on the job, very likely.

7534. He and the men that he pays make it?
Yes.

7535. Do you think, taking the case of the sideboard, that there would be any objection for the sideboard to appear as "made by so and so for Messrs. Maple and Company"?
I do not think it would answer.

7356. I think you told the Committee that you did not know why discount was always allowed, excepting that it was the regular practice in the trade?
Yes.

7537. Does it vary according to the time for payment, if payment is within a week, or a month, or two months?
We always pay prompt, but some people do not pay prompt; then of course they will not get the discount.

7538. The discount would vary according to the time?
There would be none at all if you did not pay prompt; that means within a month.

7539. In your case there is a discount?
There is a discount, because we pay prompt.

7540. After a month, there would be no discount?
No; if you gave a bill, you would not expect to get discount.

7541. That would be the custom of the trade?
That is the custom of the trade.

7542. How long do you keep your invoices?
Two or three years, I think. We keep bought ledgers always, not invoices.

7543. Could you hand in Miller's invoices, if required?
I will ascertain what we have got.

7544. The invoices and the cheques. The cheques would be kept?
You can have the cheques, I know.

7545. Mr. Maple gave us some evidence as to an action which he brought against Mr. Parnell; have you a personal knowledge of the occurrences in that?
No; I knew there was one pending, but I know nothing about it further than that.

7546. Who was Mr. Maple's solicitor at that time?
Lumley and Lumley, I believe. I wish to correct a statement I made on Friday about Gifford and Lee, and this Phemister. It appears that he gives him out sideboards to be made at piecework, and that he earns about 3 *l.* a week at it; and, if you like, you could have Gifford and Phemister before you.

7547. You told us the other day that he set Phemister up because he had not room in his own place, and that he gave him out some work to do on account of that?
It appear he earns about 3 *l.* a week by piecework; I said 9 *d.* an hour, but I should have said 3 *l.* a week. He has all the wood and brass-work of Gifford, and then takes the goods back, and Gifford finishes them and polishes them. Then, about the meeting of employés, I wish also to state that I was not near that meeting.

7548. I think you were mentioned in the newspaper?
The newspapers said I was there, but I was not near the place; I was at at home.

7549. Lord *Monkswell.*] Did you take any steps to find out who were there?
I know that all our men were there, not the assistants, only the artisan class.

7550. Did you take any steps to see that they all went to the meeting?
I had nothing to do with it.

7551. Your belief is that all the men above a certain grade went to the meeting?
I believe all the working men of the concern were there, leaving the salesman out.

7552. Why were they not there?
I think all that did go could not get into the room; it was a very small room.

7553. You have not kept a list of those who went there?
The different foremen no doubt could give you a list of those who went there.

7554. You said that a foreman was empowered to give a man an easy or a hard job; do you interfere with that at all yourself?
If a dispute were to arise, he would come to me.

7555. Would you listen to what he had to say, or would you say that it was in the discretion of the foreman?
I should listen.

7556. And if you thought that the foreman had exercised a wrongful discretion, what should you do?
I should take the side of the man.

7557. *Chairman*]

7557. *Chairman.*] Are there any makers who work exclusively for your firm with the exception of the factory in Islington?
I cannot say that there are.

7558. That is the only one?
Yes.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

THOMAS FISHER, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

7559. Earl of *Onslow.*] You were in the employment of Mr. Miller, a witness before this Committee, were you not?
Yes.

7560. In what capacity?
As manager, clerk, and salesman generally.

7561. And what were your duties?
Principally with Messrs. Maple's business.

7562. What were your duties on account of Mr. Miller?
I kept his books, sold his goods, collected his accounts, and anything else that he wanted me to do.

7563. And was Mr. Miller alone, or was he in partnership?
The first part of the time that he was in business he was in partnership with a man of the name of Wicks.

7564. When were you first employed by him?
From the time he started till the time he left off.

7565. Was it in 1880?
1880 to 1885; I was with him the whole of the time.

7566. When was it that Mr. Wicks joined partnership with Mr. Miller?
In 1880.

7567. At the beginning of his business?
Yes.

7568. And during the whole of that time, did you conduct the whole of the negotiations for Messrs. Miller and Wicks with Messrs. Maple?
Yes.

7569. Did Mr. Miller or Mr. Wicks do any business with Messrs. Maple on their own account?
Not a bit.

7570. It was done through you?
Always done through me.

7571. Therefore, with regard to all the evidence which Mr. Miller has given as to his transactions with Messrs. Maple those transactions were done through you?
Yes.

7572. Then, perhaps, you would be able to explain to the Committee something about Mr. Miller's cheques. Did you at any time receive a cheque for a less sum of money than you expected to receive?
Never.

7573. The cheque was always paid in full?
Always in full.

7574. Was no discount taken off?
Not a bit.

 7575. Not

7575. Not the trade discount, the 2½ per cent.?
Yes, of course, the trade discount.

7576. What did that trade discount amount to?
Sometimes 5 per cent., sometimes 2½, sometimes it was net.

7577. It never exceeded 5 per cent?
Except for a special job.

7578. What do you mean by a special job?
When we have had an accumulation of stock, and Mr. Regnart has cleared them out for us, we have taken as much as 15 per cent. off; that is, 10 per cent. beyond the 5 per cent.

7579. How would that be marked in the account?
Nothing beyond the 15.

7580. Discount 15 per cent.?
Yes.

7581. No statement as to the reason?
No. That would be considered a job lot.

7582. That would be for stock; not goods ordered?
Not to order.

7583. How would you take in the invoice; would you take in the invoice to the full amount?
Yes.

7584. Then you would not agree beforehand what was to be paid?
Yes, what should be taken off; but I should take it in in full, the full amount.

7585. And then from the agreed amount 15 per cent. would come off?
Yes, 15 per cent. would come off; so that I should know what I was going to receive.

7586. You mean to say that if you took in a lot of stock which you valued at 100 *l.*, and which Messrs. Maple valued at only 90 *l.*, they would pay you 90 *l.* less 15 per cent.?
Yes; but in a case like this Mr. Regnart would come over and see the goods, and then we should make an agreement, or what we call a deal, and he would say, "I will give you the price that you ask, with 15 per cent. off." There is no question whatever about anything else.

7587. Then, in fact it comes to this, that the way in which a deal is made is not by saying, "I will give you 85 *l.* instead of 100 *l.*," but "I will give you 100 *l.* with 15 per cent. off"?
Yes.

7588. It is the practice in the trade, I understand?
Yes, quite. We would rather take off 15 per cent. if we had got 200 *l.* or 300 *l.* worth of stuff in the place than keep it.

7589. But when you make a bargain you do not make a bargain for a fixed sum of money, but for so much per cent. less than you asked?
Our stock was regular; that is to say, they all had their price to them, and it came to so much, with 5 per cent. off.

7590. In fact there is a well-known price in the trade for the articles?
A well-known price for every suite that we had.

7591. And because they were not for order, but a lot of stock that you wanted to get rid of——?
We had taken off an extra amount. We have done it with other houses.

7592. When Mr. Miller said that discounts of 15 per cent. and 20 per cent. had

had been taken off by Messrs. Maple it was true, because they had been deducted for stock, but not for order?
Yes.

7593. Is it true that any further discount beyond the 2½ and 5 per cent. has been taken off any goods ordered by Messrs. Maple?
Never.

7594. Did you have anything to do with this loan of 100 *l.* that Mr. Miller said Messrs. Maple advanced to him?
I did not.

7595. If such a thing had taken place, would it have gone through your hands?
I must have known it; I should have got the money.

7596. Might it not have occurred as a private transaction between Mr. Miller and Mr. Maple?
He would not have gone to get it; he would have sent me; in fact, he has been months and never gone in to Messrs. Maple's place at all.

7597. Do you corroborate what Mr. Regnart said, that the whole story of Miller's paying 102 *l.* 10 *s.* for 100 *l.* is a lie?
I do.

7598. How were you paid when you went for your money by Messrs. Maple?
In cheques always.

7599. And on what days of the week did you get your money?
Sometimes we got it on Friday night, and sometimes on Saturday.

7600. At what hour on Saturday; what was the latest hour on Saturday?
Messrs Maple close at two. I could not get it after that, and the City Bank was open to three, so that I had plenty of time.

7601. Did you always take the cheque to the City Bank to be cashed?
When we had the account open; it was closed afterwards.

7602. While Messrs Wicks and Miller had an account there?
I could always take Messrs. Maple's cheque into the City Bank, and my own in for the wages, and get them done at the same time.

7603. Did you ever have any difficulty in getting a cheque cashed?
Never.

7604. Messrs. Maple's cheque was always treated as cash?
Always treated as cash or bank notes.

7605. Were the cheques usually crossed or open?
They were always crossed.

7606. Did you ever ask to have them made payable at the counter?
Sometimes, after an account was closed at the City Bank, and the cheque has been too large to cash in the neighbourhood. I have got Mr. Blundell Maple to write at the back of the cheque "Please pay at counter," and I have gone to the Union Bank and got the money.

7607. Was there ever any difficulty in getting that done?
Not the slightest.

7608. Was Mr. Blundell Maple the only member of the firm that could do that, or that did do that?
No, Mr. Maple, senior, would do it.

7609. Had you an account at the Union Bank?
No.

7610. That was Messrs. Maple's bank?
Yes, it was Messrs. Maple's bank. Our account was with the City Bank.

7611. What is your present employment?
I am a cabinet salesman and clerk.

7612. Who are you working for?
At present I am out of employment.

7613. How long have you been out of employment?
I have been eighteen months in the counting-house of a timber merchant as clerk only, not salesman.

7614. How long is it since you left the employ of the timber merchant?
Since the 19th of May, when my employer found out that I was about to give evidence on behalf of Messrs. Maple. I met him one night in the shed; he saw me come out of Maple's: he said, "I suppose a 10 *l.* note would shut your mouth, wouldn't it?" I made him no reply; I never spoke to him on the subject again, bnt the next week I was discharged.

7615. You say that you have been offered 10 *l.* not to give evidence before this Committee?
He said, "I suppose a 10 *l.* would shut your mouth, wouldn't it, I know nothing at all more than those words; he never spoke to me on the subject again.

7616. Was any cause of complaint alleged by your employer prior to that time?
No. I left the week after.

7617. Earl of *Limerick.*] Was it you who generally went to Messrs. Maple's for the cheques?
Yes.

7618. And where did you take them to get the money?
When we had a banking account at the City Bank I could always take them there, but after an account was closed at the City Bank, I had to get them cashed up at Messrs. Maple's counting-house, or, if it were a small cheque, I could get it done in the neighbourhood.

7619. Were you kept waiting about at Messrs. Maple's until the last moment on the Saturday before the cheques were given to you?
No; I have been kept waiting there some time while Mr. Regnart has been engaged passing the goods; when the goods were once passed I had no trouble whatever in getting the money.

7620. On what days did you generally get these cheques of Messrs. Maple?
We commenced delivering goods on the Monday up to Friday.

7621. Then on what days did you generally get cheques?
Friday night.

7622. But is it the case in many instances you did not get cheques until Saturday?
That has frequently been the case; but that has been our own fault.

7623. How is that?
Not getting the stuff in.

7624. Were there any cases in which you had taken the cheques to the City Bank and could not get any money to pay the workmen, owing to the account being overdrawn?
Never.

7625. They have never refused to give you money on a cheque sufficient to pay the workmen at the end of the week, because the account was overdrawn?
I do not know that the account ever was overdrawn; but there has not been much there sometimes; but whenever I paid a cheque of Maple's in, for 150 *l.* say, I could draw 100 *l.* out at the same time.

7626. You

7626. You think the accounts were not overdrawn there?
They would not let Miller overdraw his account.

7627. So that a cheque you took there was just as good as cash?
Mr. Maple's cheque was.

7628. Because there was no overdrawn account?
Yes, no overdrawn account.

7629. And therefore you could get money for it?
Certainly.

7630. Lord *Sandhurst.*] With regard to those bargains, where you had a lot of stuff or stock, it was sold at 15 per cent. off, you say?
Yes.

7631. It was a mutual arrangement?
A mutual arrangement.

7632. I think you said you would rather take any price than keep the goods in your workshop?
Rather make a sacrifice and get rid of them, and get the money. I have tried frequently at other houses in the trade to dispose of this stock that I had got by me, and I could not do it, not even for 15 or 17½ per cent.; they would not have them at all.

7633. Did you ever work at a loss then?
I cannot say exactly at a loss: but there was not much gain on it.

7934. What did you make; did you make 5 per cent. on it?
Yes.

7635. Then you could not get rid of these goods at 17½ per cent. off in other firms?
No.

7636. Was there anything deficient in the quality of the goods?
No. There are very few in the trade that could or would take a quantity of stuff like Messrs. Maple can.

7637. Did your business last very long?
Five years.

7638. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] When you took your statement to the counting-house, did you ever have any transactions with regard to Mr. Miller's rent do you remember?
I think that once or twice Mr. Miller's rent was deducted from Messrs. Maple's cheque. Mr. Regnart had a great objection to that; the rent was a private concern altogether of Mr. Regnart's, and he had a great objection.

7639. Earl of *Onslow.*] Never mind what Mr. Regnart's objections were; let us know what the fact were?
I believe once or twice they have been taken off Messrs. Maple's cheque.

7640. Do I understand you to say that the cheque has been drawn for a sum less the rent?
Less the rent. We paid the rent every month.

7641. Not that the cheque had been cashed, and then that the collector of rents has received the money for the rent?
No, taken off after the discount.

7642. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Taken off in some transaction?
Yes; but, as a rule, there was a gentleman called every month for the rent.

7643. Was this gentleman present on the occasions when it was taken off?
No, he would not be; being a collector in the firm of Maple and Company, he used to come every month for the rent; and if I have not had the money ready, if I or Mr. Miller have been out, I have taken it over to Mr. Regnart afterwards,

afterwards, and Mr. Regnart has said: "I shall not take it; take it upstairs to Mr. Edwards," and I have taken it up and got the receipt.

7644. Lord *Monkswell.*] Might it not be a misunderstanding as to the agreement about the discount between Mr. Miller and Mr. Maple, and might not Mr. Miller send in a statement, by accident, without the agreed discount?

The agreement between Mr. Miller and Mr. Regnart was that all goods that all goods that came in were to be 5 per cent. off.

7645. Did you say that sometimes as much as 15 per cent. was taken off. Supposing there had been haggling about this 15 per cent., might not Mr. Miller go away, thinking that the last word was that, say 5 per cent. should be taken off; but might not Mr. Regnart go away, thinking that Mr. Miller had agreed to 15 per cent. off?

Not a bit.

7646. Then you say that you sometimes went to the Union Bank instead of the City Bank; why did you go the Union Bank?

Because our account was closed at the City Bank.

7647. While you had an account at the City Bank you always went there?

Always.

7648. You have said that on those occasions when you went to the Union Bank, where had not an account, you sometimes had to ask Mr. Maple, junior, or Mr. Maple, senior, to open the cheque?

Always.

7649. That you had to go to one of those gentlemen, and that one of them always wrote at the back of the cheque, "Please pay at counter"?

Yes.

4650. But we have been told that Mr. Maple had a stamp that was used in the office, "Payable at counter"?

I cannot say; I never saw a stamp; I have got Mr. Blundell to write at the back of my cheque.

7651. If you went to the cashier, he was not at liberty to put a stamp "payable at counter" on it?

No, Mr. Maple, or Mr. Blundell Maple.

7652. Earl of *Onslow.*] The bank would not have honoured the instructions unless signed as well as stamped, would they?

Certainly not.

7653. Throughout Mr. Miller's evidence where he says: "I told him the cheque being big I should require cash; I gave him in an estimate for it, and he told me that he should want it considerably less," and so forth; he never had any dealing with Messrs. Maple, and when he says "I," he means "my agent?"

He never had any dealings, or very rarely, with Mr. Regnart.

7654. You wish the Committee to understand that when Mr. Miller says, "I," he means you?

Yes.

7655. Mr. Miller complains that he or, as it now appears, his agent, when he wanted to make any complaint, found great difficulty in getting access to any of the heads of the firm; did you ever find that difficulty?

Never in my life.

7656. When you had a difference, what did you do?

There was always Mr. Maple, senior, or Mr. Blundell there.

7657. You were always able to see them, were you?

Yes, always, from Monday morning till two o'clock on Saturday.

7658. Was

7658. Was there any arrangement between Messrs. Maple and Mr. Miller that when they were not able to supply him with orders, they would take stock from him?

No; sometimes Messrs. Maple were quiet and slack and sometimes they were busy.

7659. Lord *Sandhurst*]. How long have you known Messrs. Maple's firm?

Twenty years.

7660. Have you ever spoken of them as being a sweating firm?

Never.

7661. Or have you ever heard the place spoken of as being "the workhouse"?

Never.

7662. Earl of *Limerick.*] Did you yourself know of cases where, as you say, money for the rent was deducted before the cheque was made out?

When Mr. Regnart's rent has been paid in that way (which is very seldom; I do not think it is more than two or three times): when it has been deducted, it has always been taken out of the amount of our cheque from Messrs. Maple. Then Mr. Regnart has arranged the matter himself afterwards; I do not know how.

7663. You say that if you had an account for 100 *l.* with Messrs. Maple, you would only get what?

£. 7 18 *s.* 4 *d.* was our rent; the monthly rent.

7664. Would that amount be deducted from the 100 *l.*, and only a cheque for the balance made out to you?

If Mr. Regnart had given his sanction for that to be done; but he would not always do it; he did not like it.

7665. Have you asked Mr. Regnart to have it done?

Yes, and he has done it.

7666. And you know that of your own knowledge?

Yes, I do.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

JOHN WICKS, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

7667. Earl of *Onslow.*] ARE you partner or have you been partner with Mr. Miller?

Yes.

7668. How long were you Mr. Miller's partner?

From 1880 to 1883.

7669. And during that time was the last Witness your agent?

Mr. Fisher.

7670. Did you have any dealings with Mr. Maple or with Mr. Maple's representative through the intermediary of Mr. Fisher?

Through Mr. Fisher.

7671. Then it cannot be the case that any transactions spoken of by Mr. Miller actually took place between himself and Messrs. Maple or Messrs. Maple's representative?

No, the whole of the orders and the whole cheques and so forth were through Fisher.

7672. Did you hear the evidence of the last Witness?

Yes.

7673. And do you agree in all that he said?
I do.

7674. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Did Miller employ himself chiefly in the workshop; you say he did not transact any business with Messrs. Maple; I suppose that he was chiefly at work looking after the men.
Yes, mostly at work.

7675. And he left all the business part, the sale of goods and so forth, to Fisher?
To Fisher.

7676. Lord *Monkswell.*] Who would do the haggling that went on between your firm and Messrs. Maple; would it be done through Mr. Fisher?
All through Fisher; he was the manager, and used to go and get orders, and when orders went in he received cheques for them.

7677. Mr. Miller never at any time whatever made an agreement on his own account between Messrs. Maple and your firm?
No; not that I know of.

7678. And you are pretty clear that he never could have?
I am sure of it.

7679. Earl of *Limerick.*] Were there ever cases, to your knowledge, where your workmen could not be paid at the end of the week because you could not get the money from Messrs. Maple?
Not in my time; not in the time that I was in partnership with Miller.

7680. Would you have known it if it did happen?
Yes.

7681. Earl of *Onslow.*] Did I understand you to say that Mr. Miller was still in business?
He is working now at Stringer's in Old-street.

7682. Have you had any communication with Mr. Miller in reference to this inquiry?
He came round to my place when I was working at Wainwright's, in Hoxton, and asked to come with him and give evidence. I could not get away then.

7683. Did he wish you to give the same evidence that he did?
Most likely he did, because he said my pay would be half a guinea a day. I said, well, I could not help it, I could not get away; I could not leave the business.

7684. He offered you half a guinea a day to give evidence here?
Yes.

7685. When was that?
It might be a month back; I cannot tell exactly.

7686. It was not before May?
I suppose it must have been in the latter part of May.

7687. I asked you whether it was before May; you say it was not before May?
No, it was not before May.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. HORACE REGNART, having been re-called; is further Examined, as follows:

7688. Earl of *Limerick.*] You have heard what the previous witness, Mr. Fisher, said about the payment of rent, that it was arranged that it should be deducted from cheques. That appears to disagree with some evidence that you gave: can you explain it?
It was not arranged, I think.

7689. But

7689. But I certainly understood you to say that the amount for rent could, under no circumstances, be deducted from the cheques for goods from Miller; that the cheque would have to be made out for the full amount, and that after that payment might have been made out of the cheque?
I do not know how it is done.

7690. Then, you had entered into no arrangement with Fisher, or anybody else for having the amount deducted from the cheque?
No; the collector of the name of Edwards did that for me.

7691. Earl of *Onslow.*] You say you were not privy to any arrangement that Edwards may have made on your behalf?
No.

7692. Earl of *Limerick.*] You had no personal communication with Fisher, or anybody else, with reference to the amount being deducted from the amount due by Messrs. Maple to Miller?
I had nothing to do with that at all; the rent had to be paid, and this collector used to collect it once a month.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. GEORGE HARRISON, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows.

7693. Earl of *Onslow.*] You are a manufacturer, I think?
Yes.

7694. Where is your business?
Little Edward-street, Cumberland Market.

7694.* Do you manufacture for Messrs. Maple?
Yes.

7695. Exclusively?
No.

7696. How many men do you employ?
Now, about 20; some 18 to 20. I have employed 40 to 50.

7697. What is your rate of payment an hour?
It varies largely; I pay as much as 3 *l.* a week, and as low as 25 *s.*

7698. Do you pay your men on the same principle as Messrs. Maple; by what has been called the time-task work?
No.

7699. What is your principle of payment?
Pay them by the hour.

7700. Whether their work is valued at some given value or not?
Yes. I have one or two men that work piece-work, but the time that they work is not calculated in their work at all; as long as they produce the article properly for the money, they receive the money for it.

7701. Is all the work produced on your own premises, or do you give out work?
All of it produced on my own premises.

7702. Do you employ boys and improvers?
No.

7703. Only men over 21 years of age?
That is all.

7704. No apprentices?
No.

7705. Do Messrs. Maple pay you once a week?
Yes.

7706. For goods ordered?
Yes.

7707. What amount of discount do they take off?
Two and a-half per cent.

7708. Does it never vary?
Never.

7709. Did you ever make goods for stock?
Yes.

7710. And do they take off a larger discount than 2½ per cent. for that?
Never more than 2½ per cent.

7711. Have you ever sent in a large amount of stock that has not been ordered?
Yes.

7712. Up to what value of stock?
£. 100, or 200 *l.* at times.

7713. And you have never had more than 2½ per cent. taken off?
Never.

7714. Then, in your case at least, they pay you equally for goods that they order, and goods that they buy of you that they have not ordered?

7715. Have you received your money in crossed cheques, or in open cheques?
When I first commenced business with Messrs. Maple I used to receive my money in crossed cheques, and while I had no banking account. I had my cheques served in the same way as the last witness told you; written on the back by Mr. Blundell Maple: "Pay at counter." When I had an account myself at the City Bank I have paid them in in the usual way.

7716. Have you ever had any difficulty in obtaining the money from the bank for those cheques?
No.

7717. Have you always been able to get your money from Messrs. Maple to pay your workmen?
They have paid me such a fair amount for my work that I have always had sufficient money at the bank to pay my workmen.

7718. You say you are in a sufficiently sound position to pay your workmen, independently of whether you get your cheques paid or not?
Yes.

7719. Therefore, any evidence you may give on that point would not apply to the case of a man who was hard up?
No. I should like to just say, as regards the discount, that I made a complaint to Mr. Maple, senior, some time ago, it must be 21 years ago, about the deduction of 2½ per cent. off my account, and his answer to me was this: "Do you mean to tell me that you cannot afford to take 2½ per cent. off your account, that you cut it so fine?" I said, "That is so." "Then," he said, "charge me 5 per cent. more for all you do for me. I do not want anybody to work for me unless they get a fair living for what they do."

7720. You said to him, practically, "The amount for which I am working for you is too low;" and he said, "I will pay you more?"
Yes.

7721. But whether it was a deduction of 2½ per cent., or whether it was net, would not have affected that contract?
Not exactly.

7722. Is

7722. Is the majority of your work for Messrs. Maple?
Yes; 90 per cent.

7723. Did I understand you to say that you never had any complaint against Mr. Maple?
Not at all.

7724. Therefore, you never had any desire to see the heads of the firm?
Yes, I meet them every day.

7725. Have you ever had any complaint to make?
No complaints to make; they always treated me very kindly and very fairly.

7726. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] How long have you worked for Messrs. Maple?
Twenty-three years.

7727. Earl of *Limerick.*] Have you ever had any deductions made on account of faulty work over and above the 2½ per cent. ordinary deduction?
I will explain something that occurred three or four weeks ago. My foreman delivered to Messrs. Maple 12 tables that were ordered, and as I walked into the shop Mr. Regnart came to me and said, "Harrison, those tables sent in by you are not what they ought to be. I wish you would go and look at them." I went and looked at them, and found that they were not what they ought to be, not properly polished. He said, "We cannot deliver them to our customer like that; if you like I will let one of my polishers finish them for you if you will pay us for it." My answer was, "I think it will do my men more good to send them back; they will see that bad work will not pass here." I said that I would rather take them back, though it will cost more trouble. I took them back, and I was paid the full price for them when they were delivered the second time.

7728. Have you ever had any cases in which deductions have been made for indifferent work?
No; invariably if there is any complaint I take the work back again and make it perfect and get my full price for it.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. WILLIAM WRIGHT, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

7729. Earl of *Onslow.*] What are you?
A cabinet manufacturer.

7730. Do you manufacture for Messrs. Maple?
Yes,

7731. Exclusively?
No.

7732. Is your principal work for Messrs. Maple?
Yes.

7733. And do you employ a large amount of labour?
According to circumstances; we at the present time have about 30 men nearly all employed upon Messrs. Maple's work.

7734. All men; not boys?
All men.

7735. Have you any experience of the complaints that have been made by other witnesses against Messrs. Maple of discount being arbitrarily taken off?
No.

7736. Or of the other things that we heard of?
No. My accounts run from 400 *l.* to 500 *l.* and sometimes 800 *l.* a month; Messrs. Maple have one of those accounts monthly, a monthly statement, but not a single deduction have they made upon it.

7737. Your object in coming here is to say that you have no complaints to make against Messrs. Maple's way of doing business?
I was invited by Mr. Regnart to come here.

7738. Have you come of your own will without being paid?
Certainly.

7739. Lord *Sandhurst.*] How did you begin your business; were you an apprentice in a large firm, or what?
No, I was brought up with my father; we have been in business 40 years.

7740. And you were apprenticed to him?
I served my apprenticeship to my father, and my father died some three years back, and I have carried on the business since. To show there is no exclusiveness may I hand in this (*handing in a circular*).

7741. Then you have been brought up to thoroughly understand the trade, I suppose?
Thoroughly.

7742. Not exclusively to be a stuffer?
No, a manufacturer of bedroom and library furniture generally.

7743. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] How do your journeymen, as a rule, learn their trade; do they learn it as regular apprentices, or as working with their fathers?
It used to be so, but, unfortunately, many men have taken their sons and sent them to other shops, and they have got competent to the work in that way.

7744. But the system of apprenticeship is very rare now?
It is nearly nil; we have no apprentices, and have not had for many years.

7745. Lord *Monkswell.*] Is it a good thing, or a bad thing, that the system has been done away with?
I think it is bad.

7746. Earl of *Onslow.*] Mr. Richards, when he gave evidence before the Committee, stated that he had been asked to make a suite, or several suites, for Messrs. Maple at a certain price, and he declined to do it, and that somebody else came in and took the job, and I understand it was you; is that so?
Probably he meant that I, with several other manufacturers, have made samples for different hotels which we have largely supplied, not only to Messrs. Maple, but to many of the West-end firms besides; and whether it was to Messrs. Maple or to other firms there would be invariably one or two sample suites of furniture made for selection.

7747. Did you send in a sample on this occasion?
Yes.

7748. And was your sample selected?
I do not know.

7749. You got the job, at all events?
Yes.

7750. Was the pattern of which you made your suite from a pattern made by Mr. Richards?
No; I believe all the patterns were alike.

7751. What was the pattern you made from?
What was suggested to us to do.

7752. By

7752. By a design, or by an actual piece of furniture?
By a requirement of what was ordered.

7753. Do you mean a written description, or the object?
I have a rough sketch of the wardrobe here which we were told to do, and we made it. Mr. Richards at that time was paying a very high price for his labour (*handing in a sketch of the wardrobe*).

7754. What I asked you was a design given to you, or a specification given to you, or did you see an actual piece of furniture?
A specification was given to us, and we made it from that.

7755. Not from a piece of furniture, which might or might not have been made by Mr. Richards?
No.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. HARRIS LEBUS, is called in, and having been sworn; is Examined as follows:

7756. Earl of *Onslow*.] Are you also a maker in the cabinet trade?
Yes.

7757. Do you work for Messrs. Maple?
Yes.

7758. Exclusively?
No.

7759. Do you do all the work that you do on your own premises, or put some out?
All on my own premises.

7760. Is your labour paid by time or by piece, or by time-task?
By piecework.

7761. Entirely?
Entirely.

7762. Do the men who work on piecework employ other labour themselves under them?
Not generally.

7763. Sometimes?
Sometimes.

7764. On your premises?
At times, certainly.

7765. Then are those men under your control?
Certainly.

7766. And how do you make an arrangement with the piece-worker; do you say to him "Make me a piece of furniture, and I will pay you so much for it"?
Yes.

7767. And "You may bring in what labour you like to do it?
No.

7678. What do you do?
We give a man a wardrobe out and he says it would suit him if he had a man to do the hard work for him, the cheaper labour; some men have been in the cabinet trade 25 years, and they have not the full vigour that a young man has, and they cannot do the hard work, and, therefore, they employ younger men to do the harder work, and by so doing they become journeymen, proper journeymen.

7769. How old are these men that they employ; under the age of 21?
No.

7770. They are over the age of 21?
Yes. I have on my premises 190 men in all, and out of the 190 we have only eight lads under 18, and none between 18 and 21.

7771. Are these lads under 18 engaged in this hard work you have spoken of?
No; they are engaged by me to clean out shops and go for errands backwards and forwards, and so forth.

7772. They are not skilled?
Not at all.

7773. The men who come in and do the hard work, are they hoping to rise in the cabinet trade?
Yes.

7774. And do you consider that they will?
Yes, I am sure of it. I can give you an instance of it. I have young men in my factory at the present time whom I had in as a help after they had been apprenticed to other firms and now they have become journeymen and are earning very good money, in fact, first-class money.

7775. Then in fact it is a form of apprenticeship?
As improvers.

7776. And when they leave your employment, or the employment of those whom you employ, will they be able to get work as general upholsterers, or only in one particular branch?
My branch is cabinet manufacturing, bed-room furniture, and office furniture is my speciality.

7777. Will they be capable of constructing a piece of furniture from beginning to end?
Certainly.

7778. And will they be confined to one particular piece of furniture?
They make themselves wardrobe or toilet tables, or wash-hand stand makers; there are men who would rather make themselves used to one particular part of the trade, and earn their money that way.

7779. But there is nothing to prevent their having full knowledge of the trade?
Certainly not.

7780. Have you any control over the wages that are paid these men who are employed by men under you?
No.

7781. You have nothing to do with that?
Nothing to do with it.

7782. Is there much competition for such employment?
Not at all; it is very hard to get them.

7783. What sort of wages do they earn?
From 28 *s.* to 30 *s.*; I should think they average from 25 *s.* to 30 *s.*

7784. Have there been any strikes amongst the workmen in the cabinet trade?
I have not experienced it. In my factory I have men that have been with me now 16 or 17 years, and in fact I do not believe that I have a man that would care to leave me if I wanted him to go.

7785. We were told by Mr. Imlay that there have been disturbances?
Not in my line of trade; there may have been in the upholstery; I am not aware of that.

7786. What

7786. What is the lowest wage that the men in your employ over 21 would be earning?
I have not a man in my employ at piecework earning less than from 30 *s.* to 2 *l.* 10 *s.* or 3 *l.* a week.

7787. What is 30 *s.* a week per hour?
He works 53½ hours; it is about 6½ per hour, I should think.

7788. Have you any knowledge of the price that is paid to West-end cabinet-makers?
None whatever. I do not interfere with anybody else's business.

7789. Mr. Maple told us that they were paid 9 *d.* an hour; that is rather higher than what you have named?
I have men in my employ earning 1 *s.* 3 *d.* an hour. One man can do the work twice as quick as another; we should not give them the same pay; it would be ridiculous to do so.

7790. But you would not be able to say what the average wages was, and compare what you give yourself with that?
No; it varies.

7791. You have never known men earning less wages than 6 *d.* an hour?
I do not know; there are some men that are not able to earn 4 *d.* an hour, master men especially.

7792. Those are men employing others under them, you mean?
Men manufacturing; they do not earn 4 *d.*, they do not earn 2 *d.* some of them.

7793. Do you say that the workman is better of than the employer?
Very often.

7794. In fact, as we have been told in some other trades, the sweater has quite as bad time of it as the sweatee?
I do not know what you term the sweater.

7795. I will call them the sub-contractor and the person he employs; the sub-contractor sometimes earns less than the man he employs.
Yes, he would.

7796. Earl of *Limerick.*] Is any of your work taken off the premises?
None whatever.

7797. It is all made on your own premises?
All made on my own premises.

The Witness was directed to withdraw.

JAMES CORP, is called in, and having been sworn; is Examined, as follows:

7798. Earl of *Onslow.*] WHAT are you?
I am a foreman of the joiners and cabinet makers at Messrs. Maples'.

7799. You are a foreman; not like the last witness, an employer?
No.

7800. What is your duty as foreman; do you have anything to do with the regulation of the wages?
Yes.

7801. How do you pay your men; do you pay them by the hour, or by the piece?
By the hour. I have one or two that work piece work.

7802. Principally by the hour?
Yes.

 7803. What

7803. What is the average rate of wages that you pay?
I pay 9 *d.* an hour.

7804. All round?
I believe there are three or four that get less. I might inform your Lordships that some people when they take a man on ask him what wages he wants. I never do that. I simply give him a job, and set him to work, and pay him 9 *d.* an hour.

7805. And then at the end of the time when he has done his work, do you appraise the value of it?
I watch him; take stock of him as he goes on.

7806. And suppose his work is not up to 9 *d.* an hour?
I get rid of him.

7807. And suppose it is worth more than 9 *d.* a hour?
The men gauge themselves; sometimes the man is worth very much more than 9 *d.*

7808. Where you find out that he is a good workman at 9 *d.* an hour, you do not interfere with the bargain?
I have made it 9½ *d.*, 10 *d.* and 10½ *d.* But I might tell you when I have set on a fresh man, scores of times in my experience when he has been at work a day or two, I have found out that what he has done has been absolutely useless, and that he has spoilt materials as well; of course I sack him.

7809. What is your relation to Mr. Imlay?
Nothing whatever; a different department altogether.

7810. What is your department?
I have joinery and cabinet making, both joiners and cabinet makers, and the whole of the machinery.

7811. And what is Mr. Imlay?
An upholsterer.

7812. Now supposing you set two men on to a job, one of whom is a good workman, worth say 10 *d.* or 11 *d.* an hour, and another man that you pay 9 *d.* an hour to, how can you tell whether that man during the time he has been making a particular article of furniture has worked up to the value of 9 *d.* or 11 *d.* per hour?
By strict observance. After an experience of 32 years a man ought to be a judge how a man is working. When a man comes into the shop I can tell by the sharpening of his tools, about what he is worth, nearly.

7813. Supposing two men are working on the same article, and at the end of the time the article has taken a great deal longer than it ought to have taken, to whom do you attach the blame for that?
Myself.

7814. You mean you ought to be so constantly watching the workmen as to know whose fault it was?
You must understand that a cabinetmaker takes such a wide range. You might divide his trade into a hundred different branches. A man that makes a packing-case calls himself a cabinet-maker, and a man that makes a most elaborate piece of furniture calls himself a cabinet-maker; and for the last 15 years men have made a speciality of one thing with the object of earning much more money; so that a man who may be good at one thing is not always good at another. Take a man that has been used to chests of drawers; he might earn 1 *s.* or 1 *s.* 3 *d.* an hour comfortably; but put him to looking-glass frames, he would not earn 3 *d.*

7815. That I can understand; but what I want to get at is this: Mr. Imlay told us that in his department it was absolutely necessary to adopt the time-task system, and what I want to know is, in what respect does the cabinet-making branch differ from the upholstering branch that you are able to pay a man

man a regular fixed wage, 9 *d.* or 10½ *d.* an hour, without deductions. If the work is not finished within the time you think it ought to be, and Mr. Imlay is not ——?

There is this difference, that invariably in the upholstery trade it is repetition of stock; a chair of this pattern or that pattern; so that they know in the course of years what each article ought to take. In our work nearly every article differs; it it made from drawings; you must remember that we do the first-class cabinet joinery. I have adopted the system of working cabinet-makers and joiners together. I am a joiner myself, and I have worked five years in a cabinet shop, and have seen the advantage of adopting that system.

7816. But supposing that a man does not turn out a cabinet in the number of hours that you expect him to do, what do you do; do you pay him 9 *d.* an hour all the same?

Yes, always pay him 9 *d.* an hour. If I do not consider that the man has done justice to the best of his ability I sack him. I keep no bad workmen. I would not do it.

7817. Then, in fact, unless a man works up to your standard, you get rid of him?

Yes.

7818. You never make any deduction for slow work?

No, nor yet spoilt material, as to which I am sorry to say that there are a number of cabinet-makers that go round and get a job, being out of employment, and you find, when they have got all the material out, and you think they are going to put the job together, that it is all spoilt, I have been served like that a number of times.

7819. Then your branch, your department of Messrs. Maple's, differs entirely from Mr. Imlay's?

Entirely.

7820. They are not to be compared together?

Not to be compared; they are only men milliners in Mr. Imlay's, that is, comparatively speaking.

7821. When you pay your men, do you pay them on Friday night?

We pay on Saturday.

7822. Is it the practice to pay the journeymen on Saturdays always?

In establishments like Messrs. Maple's, if they paid them all on Friday night, or Saturday it would take so long. Some are paid on Friday night, some are paid on Saturdays; all my men have their money before half-past one o'clock. My men leave off at one on Saturdays, winter and summer.

7823. Have you ever had any complaints of the wages you give?

No.

7824. Never had any dissatisfaction expressed?

I have heard dissatisfaction expressed sometimes when I have got rid of men.

7825. But I am speaking of the men who continue to be in your employment?

No. I have got men who have been there ever since I have been there.

7826. When one of your men working under you, I understand it is joinery work ——?

Joinery and cabinet making.

7827. When he leaves you, say, he is a complete joiner?

I have never had but, I think, only two boys learning the trade since I have been with Messrs. Maple. I do not believe in employing youngsters.

7828. You have no apprentices, you mean?

No.

7829. Have you seen Mr, Parnell's evidence?
Yes.

7830. And have you seen what he says as to the wages that are earned?
Yes.

7831. Do you agree with what he says?
Decidedly not. In the writing of members of his own society I have their time sheets if you like to look at them.

7832. At No 2944 Mr. Parnell is asked, "When you spoke of 'society wages,' what did you mean"? and his answer was, "Wages generally recognised by the societies (there are five distinct societies in London), that is 9 *d.* per hour"; and further on he says, "There was an agitation then (in 1872 or 1873) for an advance of 10 per cent. in prices of piece-work and 1 *d.* per hour rise in the day-work wages. It was raised from 8 *d.* to 9 *d.* without a strike"; and the price was then maintained. Do you agree to that 9 *d.* an hour is the society wage?
Yes.

7833. Then at No. 2986 Mr. Parnell, in reply to a question that I put to him, namely, "Your principal grievance is that by reason of this cheaper manufacture, and by reason of the sweating system, the wages of the cabinet-makers have, in some cases, been reduced from 9 *d.* to 6 *d.* per hour?" says, "In some cases to very much less than that. (*Q.*) What is the lowest?—(*A.*) The lowest I have come across has been 3 *d.* (*Q.*) But those cases are very exceptional?—(*A.*) No." Have you anything to say about that?
I do not know anything of that as applying to Maple's; but I believe that there is another part in which he speaks about what men at Maple's are able to earn.

7834. Do men at Maple's earn less than 9 *d.* an hour?
Not in my department; there might be a few at 8½ *d.*

7835. But there are none earning 6 *d.* or 3 *d.*?
Only two boys.

7836. Then if Mr. Parnell said that the men in the joiners department, or whatever your department is called, were earning less than 8½ *d.* an hour, it would not be correct?
Decidedly not. I maintain that the value of the evidence of a person depends on the character of the person who has given it.

7837. But I am not going into the character of Mr. Parnell?
I assume that your Lordships are met here to inquire into the Sweating System and its causes.

7838. The Committee have decided that they will not hear any evidence brought forward by Messrs. Maple as to the way in which evidence was collected on the other side, and I understand that you are going to give some evidence as to the character of one of the Witnesses; is that so?
Outside that.

7839. Will you say shortly what your evidence is going to be directed to, and the Committee will consider whether they will accept it?
I should say that one of the primary causes of sweating, as it is termed, in the cabinet trade has been the action of the society, or whatever it is that Mr. Parnell represents.

7840. I am quite willing to hear anything about the sweating system; if you can give us any information on that you may do so?
I maintain, my Lord, that in times past, I have been longer on the board than Mr. Parnell; his knowledge of London only dates back from 1872.

7841. Leave Mr. Parnell out of the question. What do you know yourself.
He is sweater at Whiteley's.

7842. I do not want to know anything about Mr. Parnell. If you can give us

us any evidence about the Sweating System you may do so, but leave personalities out of the question?

I maintain that one of the primary causes of sweating, as it is known in the cabinet trade, owes part of its origin to the Cabinet Makers' Society.

7843. In what way?

In time past this society, which was a society in years gone by, has degenerated into a sort of Radical Socialistic Mutual Admiration Society, something of that kind. In years past, in London their influence was great; if men were not society men they had a certain amount of influence with them, if the men did not do as they wished; in these days boycotting has got to be the term; a man was almost boycotted.

7844. Will you say how that bears upon the question of sweating. I understand about trades unionism, but what we want to know is in what way does that affect the sweater?

As I understand, sweating in the cabinet trade is due to these small masters who have sprung up that work for themselves, and many a man has been boycotted by these people, and has had no other resource than to go to a little timber yard, and if hard up to borrow 1 *l.*, and go and buy a little timber and make up something, and take out to sell.

7845. I understand you to say that men who have been driven out of the business by the trades unions have then set up on their own account as sweaters, sub-contractors, we will call them?

They make for themselves; and, of course, it is well known that the East-end swarms with them, men who have started for themselves; and when they have made up the furniture, they hawk it about and sell it, and they most have the money on Saturday night; and that is one of the causes of the so-called Sweating System, or what I might term the labour being brought down to a very low price in the cabinet trade.

7846. Is it within your personal knowledge that men who have been compelled to leave your work through not joining the trades unions, have actually, as a matter of fact, set up as small makers themselves?

"Within your personal knowledge," you say? One can only believe what men have told you.

7847. Do you know such a case?

I happened to live next door to a man in 1868 or 1870 who was, through the action of the society, boycotted, and he could not get a job; he started on this very system, going and buying stuff; he and his brother and two sons would go out on a Monday morning and make up a few articles, and they had to sell them on Saturday or thereabouts; they were four men, and I have heard his own wife say that if they got 50 *s.* to 3 *l.* they considered that they had had an extraordinary week's work. So that the four men would not average 15 *s.* a-week.

7848. Do you know where this man is now?

He is dead; this was in 1868.

7849. You do not know of anybody who has actually had to leave his work on account of the action of the Trades Union Society who could come before this Committee and give such evidence as you suggest?

No, it is some years ago, when I went into this question. I am a trades unionist, and have been since 1864, and I know a little of these things.

7850. But you are not at this moment aware of any person who has been obliged to leave his work through the action of the Trades Union Society who could give evidence to say that he had been obliged to establish himself as a small sub-contractor?

No; I am only giving this the same as a number of witnesses did in the preliminary part of the investigation from what is their opinion and what has come under their own knowledge.

7851. We have had your opinion; I asked whether you could support it at all?
No.

7852. Is there anything else you wish to add?
Yes; on a subject which you have received evidence upon before, namely, the registration of factories under inspection, if you would like my opinion on that.

7853. Certainly?
My opinion is that every place that a person works in should be registered, not for any fee, and registered at the police station in the locality wherever that workshop or factory, or whatever it is is carried on.

7854. Who is to register?
Any person carrying on the business.

7855. Do you see any reason why the persons who employ him should not be bound to keep a register on the premises upon which the work they put out is done?
Decidedly not; but it might so happen that a person has two or three men, or a man or two at work for him, and might be working for three or four people.

7856. But is there any reason why each of these three or four people should not have upon his register the fact that he is employing that man at those premises to work for him?
No, not in my opinion.

7857. Would it not be simpler for the purposes of inspection that the larger manufacturers, such as Maple's, should keep this register, instead of its being necessary to go into every small house and find out whether a man was employing hands there without being registered?
But you are speaking of inspection under the Factory Inspector?

7858. I am not speaking of any special inspectors; I am supposing that if you had any legislation of that kind it would be necessary that you should have somebody to see that it was carried out?
Yes.

7859. Would it not be easier for the inspector to ascertain whether all the places were properly registered, if the register was kept by the people who put out the work, rather than simply in the houses of the people who employ the labour?
Yes; but how are you going to register in that manner people that employ themselves, perhaps a man and his wife and his son; something like that, and take the article from the east to the west of London, and sell it where they can.

7860. Then you would be in favour of registering what is known as a family workshop?
I would be in favour of having a place registered where work of any description is carried on; at the police station. Then another thing, with regard to factory inspectors; I think it would take about 600 factory inspectors to inspect all the places in London once a week; it would be a great cost. My system would be to have a register of every one where they did work at home; to register it at the police station in the locality, and the police inspector should instruct a policeman in his spare time, or at any time, to call there, or even the policeman on his beat, and thereby you would have a thorough inspection of factories, but with very little additional cost.

7861. Do you imagine that the police have much spare time?
It would be no more trouble for a policeman to walk in as he is going by a place, than it is for him to stand at the corner outside for five minutes.

7862. Would he not be neglecting his other duties?
It would be only for a minute or two; he finds a minute or two for going anywhere else.

7863. If

7863. If it would be necessary to have 600 more men to do the inspecting, would it not be equally necessary to have 600 additional men in the police force to do this particular duty?
No; nor yet 50, nor yet 10.

7864. That is your opinion?
That is my opinion. I should like to say a word on Government contracts.

7865. Have you any knowledge of that?
I have a little knowledge of it.

7866. In the cabinet trade?
You might term it in the cabinet trade.

7867. In any other trade?
A knowledge of what I have seen and gathered up, the same as Mr. Parnell did in the Curtain-road.

7868. We want only evidence from your own knowledge?
It is the system; the Government contracts are given out in such large quantities that it prevents the small people, who could really manufacture and do it cheaper, from doing so.

7869. Have you ever worked on a Government contract, or had any accurate knowledge of a Government contract?
Yes.

7870. What happened in that case?
Well, I should be sorry to tell you.

7871. We shall be very happy to receive any evidence you actually know; but it is no use to tell us about a general system, the accurate facts of which are not within your knowledge; do you know anything of any actual Government contracts put out, upon which you worked, or any of your employés worked?
No, I cannot go into it so close as that.

7872. Earl of *Onslow.*] We shall have other witnesses who do know all about it.

The Witness is directed to withdraw

MR. JOHN PADDY, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

7873. Earl of *Onslow.*] WHAT are you?
A chair and sofa manufacturer.

7874. Do you work for Messrs. Maple?
Yes.

7875. And you have heard the evidence that has been given by the other witnesses at work for Messrs. Maple?
I have.

7876. Have you any reason to be dissatisfied with their treatment of you?
I should not go there if I had.

7877. But none of these allegations that have been made against them of unfair discount and so forth have ever come within your experience?
No; I have verbal orders at times, and written orders, and sometimes I agree to a price and sometimes not; but there has been no discount taken off my account except the 2½ per cent. I might say that I take very great pains in delivering properly what I agree to do.

7878. You have no complaints to make against Messrs. Maple?
No, nothing whatever.

7879. And how long have you worked for them?
About seven years.

7880. Lord *Monkswell.*] Do you manufacture principally for Maple?
Several of the best houses in London; I work for Gillow's, Hampton's, and several of the best houses in the provinces.

7881. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] How are your hands paid, by time?
Some piece work and some hour work.

7882. They are paid different pieces?
Yes. I may have one man worth five shillings and at the next bench a man worth ten shillings.

7883. But they remain fixed, at least for a time?
Yes.

7884. You do not make any difference between what they get for one job and what they get for another when they are working by time?
If I think a man is too long over his job, directly he has done that job I speak to him about it.

7885. You do not deduct something?
I do not deduct, but I do not keep a man long that I have to grumble with.

7886. You send him away?
I get rid of him because it is not worth while to keep a man about you that you are dissatisfied with.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. ROBERT DALLAS, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

7887. Earl of *Onslow.*] Are you also a manufacturer?
Yes.

7888. Do you manufacture for Messrs. Maple?
Yes.

7889. As well as for other firms?
Yes.

7890. Have you any complaint to make of the manner in which Messrs. Maple treat you?
None whatever. My work goes in there on Monday up to Thursday; on Friday I get my cheque. I have never had anything knocked off my work, only 2½ per cent., which is understood.

7891. And do you say that Messrs. Maple's treatment of the makers who work for them is equal to that of the other dealers that you work for?
Quite so.

7892. Whatever complaints other people may have, at any rate you have none to make?
I have not any to make. I have worked nine years for the firm.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. JAMES WATSON, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

7893. Earl of *Onslow.*] Do you also make for Messrs. Maple?
Yes.

7894. Did you hear the evidence of the last Witness?
Yes.

7895. Do you agree in all that he said?
In all that he said.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. RICHARD COOPER, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

7896. Earl of *Onslow.*] ARE you also a manufacturer who works for Messrs. Maple?
Yes.

7897. And for other firms?
Yes.

7898. And do you say that they treat you quite as well as the other firms?
Yes.

7899. And the evidence that the last witness gave you entirely corroborate?
Yes.

7900. And whatever complaints other people may have to make against Messrs. Maple, at any rate, you have none?
None whatever.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. WILLIAM PARNELL, having been called in; is further Examined, as follows:

7901. *Chairman.*] I WANT to ask you about an answer which Mr. Maple gave on page 580, No. 5843. Mr. Maple, speaking of you, quotes these words: "Mr. Parnell stated that Maple was a sweater of the sweaters. A Committee was formed in defence of Mr. Parnell, and Mr. Parnell will tell you that the action brought was withdrawn, although he is, of course, a man of no capital." Mr. Maple was quoting then from the evidence of Mr. Arnold White. Then Mr. Maple goes on to say, "Mr. Parnell made a statement, which I characterised as being perfectly untrue and wrong, and I instructed my solicitors to proceed against him, for as I said before, we are no sweaters; we do not sweat any employés ourselves, nor do we employ any firm who are sweaters themselves." Then I asked Mr. Maple: "You are alluding to the action you brought against Mr. Parnell?" And his answer is: "Which I was commencing to bring against Mr. Parnell; and my solicitor's letter to Mr. Parnell was as follows, on the 13th of December last: 'Sir, we are instructed by our client, Mr. J. Blundell Maple, M.P., to apply to you with reference to certain slanderous statements which, we are informed, you made respecting him at a public meeting held in connection with the Labour Electoral Association for Fulham, in the schoolroom, Walham-grove, on Wednesday evening, 30th ultimo. The statements in question, as reported to us, were to the effect that our client, whom you describe as the Tory candidate for Dulwich,

was a sweater of the sweaters, and that he compelled his men to work for 12, 14, and 16 hours a day, and sent them home on Saturday with 20*s.*, 25*s.*, or 30*s.* for their week's labour. We are informed that you further stated to the meeting that our client was in the habit of paying his men with cheques, and charging them 2½ per cent. for cashing the cheques. All these statements, we are instructed by our client to say, are absolutely unfounded, and are malicious slanders. As we are instructed to issue process at once, we shall be glad, if you will let us know the name of your solicitor, who will accept service on your behalf.' " Then Mr. Maple goes on to say that his solicitor received a letter from you to this effect: "Gentlemen, I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter, dated the 13th instant, in reference to certain alleged statements of mine respecting your client, Mr. J. Blundell Maple, M.P., and to say that as quoted in your letter, they are entirely incorrect, and do not represent what I said. I am yours, &c., *William Parnell.*" Then Mr. Maple continued: "My solicitor therefore advised me not to proceed further in the action against him, and that is the reason why the action was dropped." I want to know if you have anything to say as to that?

I should like to say that as far as Mr. Maple has gone, what he has stated in reference to what took place between his solicitors and myself is perfectly correct; but I am somewhat in the position of establishing my character before those to whom I appealed to assist me in my defence. If Mr. Maple decided upon the receipt of my letter, not to proceed with the action, why was I served with the writ three days after the date that Messrs. Maple's solicitors ought to have received that letter? That letter of mine I believe was written on the 15th of December; I have not the dates with me now, but I sent a letter to the clerk, and I thought that some notice would have been taken of it before; but to-day I came away without my memoranda; but I believe I wrote that letter on the 15th of December. On Monday night, I believe, the 19th of December, after I got home from work I received ——

7902. The letter quoted here, Mr. Maple says, is dated the 13th of December?
I believe mine is the 15th.

7903. You think yours was written on the 15th.
Messrs. Maple's solicitors' letter wss written on the 13th of December, and my reply to it was the 15th, I believe. On the Monday night after I sent that reply to Messrs. Lumley and Lumley, I was served with a writ, Monday night being the 19th of December, Messrs. Lumley and Lumley I presume received through my solicitor a notice that I had entered an appearance against the action, but no communication was made either to me or my solicitor, that Mr. Maple did not intend going on with the case until the 13th of February 1888, and then only in answer to a letter written by my solicitor to Messrs. Lumley and Lumley asking them to put their Statement of Claim in. The action was dismissed for want of prosecution, on the 5th of March, Mr. Maple having to pay costs. Mr. Maple paid the taxed costs of the action. My only reason for asking permission to make this explanation was that of course if the action had been dropped in consequence of the receipt of my letter, the people to whom I applied for assistance would naturally think I applied after knowing that the action was not to go on. I should also like to ask your Lordships, while I am here, whether we shall be permitted to give rebutting evidence to any evidence that may be put forward, contradicting what we may have said.

7904. That will be a matter for the Committee to decide. I understand you to say you are not quite certain about the date of your reply?
I am positive in my mind; it is the 15th.

7905. As I understand you, you say you were served with a writ three days after you wrote this letter, and that you were not aware that the action was dropped until the 13th of February?
Not until the 13th of February.

7906. Earl

7906. Earl of *Onslow*]. When you refer to that from whom you asked assistance, I presume you mean your trade society?
Trade unionists, not only my own society.

7907. Have they expressed any dissatisfaction with you at the evidence you have given before the Committee?
Some of them thought I did not make it quite strong enough.

7908. Against Messrs. Maple?
Against others as well as Messrs. Maple.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to To-morrow, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Martis, 10° *Julii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of DERBY.
Earl of ONSLOW.
Viscount GORDON (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord CLINTON.
Lord CLIFFORD OF CHUDLEIGH.
Lord KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord MONKSWELL.
Lord THRING.

LORD KENRY (EARL OF DUNRAVEN AND MOUNT-EARL), IN THE CHAIR.

THE REVEREND R. C. BILLING, D.D., having been called in; is further Examined, as follows:

7909. *Chairman.*] I WANT to call your attention to some evidence you gave before the Committee on the 15th of June; it is on page 497, and in reply to Question 5061. The question is, "Does this pauper immigration of which you have spoken tend to increase?" And the answer is: "I cannot say that it does tend to increase, but it has not diminished to the extent that some may think. Week by week they are still arriving" (that is, the foreign immigrants). "The Jewish authorities are most anxious to stop it. It is not long ago that the Member for the Whitechapel district, Mr. Samuel Montagu, a most liberal man, actually took back himself a body of immigrants in the steamer which came from Hamburg. He took them back because he knew the miserable condition to which they would be reduced if they landed in England; he took them back to Hamburg, but although they had been allowed to step off the quays in Hamburg into the boat, they were not allowed to step off the boat on to the quays; they are quite ready to allow them to come to us, but not ready to receive them back again." Have you anything to say with regard to that answer?

In the proof of the evidence that was sent to me I corrected, I would say, a very unpardonable mistake (I do not know how I fell into it) in quoting Mr. Montagu in connection with that; and I also immediately wrote to the papers, in which a report of that answer was given, and said that I had made a mistake. My informant in regard to that is a gentleman now out of England. I have written to him, and hope presently to receive a reply; but it was altogether a blunder on my part to mention Mr. Montagu in connection with it. I do not do not know how I fell into it.

7910. As I understand it, you believe that the facts are correct?

7911. But that you were mistaken in attributing the action to Mr. Montagu?

Yes.

7912. Lord *Clinton.*] Is there anything in the evidence you have given which you wish to withdraw?

Nothing at all.

7913. You have read Dr. Adler's evidence, no doubt?
I have read Dr. Adler's evidence most carefully. I am sorry to disagree with a man of so great authority, but there is nothing that I can withdraw. I have read his evidence carefully, and I am quite sure he is not aware of a great deal that we who live amongst the people are aware of, and that is passing from day to day. I might say that I am sorry to be compelled to confirm what Dr. Adler has said with regard to the state of the female population of the Jews. When I first knew that district, it was an extraordinary thing for any Jewess to be living an immoral life; I am sorry to say that that is not the exception now, and those who are in this condition are those whom Dr. Adler refers; I entirely agree with him; they are those who have lost their character for the most part before they come here. It just points to the fact that those who are coming in this way are a very low class indeed.

7914. Do you attribute that in any way directly to the Sweating System?
No. There is not the slightest doubt that the Sweating System as it is carried on is not friendly to morality, quite the contrary.

7915. You mean the association of men and women?
Yes, and the way in which they herd together.

7916. At their work, you mean?
At their work; and the way in which they are overcrowded too where they live, where it is impossible for them to have the decencies of life.

7917. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] From your experience, if you were told of the existence of a tailor's workshop where men and women were employed together, would you expect that the result would be deleterious with regard to the women, owing to the conversation that would take place?
Yes, whether they were Jews or Gentiles.

7918. I was speaking of the question generally?
Yes.

7919. Have you had a regular system of visitation in Spitalfields for the common lodging-houses?
Yes.

7920. Has that brought out any facts bearing on this subject?
Jews are not to be found, as a rule, in the common lodging-houses; they are to be found in what are almost worse in many respects than the common lodging-houses, because they are not under such strict rule and supervision; what we know as the furnished rooms, so called, on the *lucus a non lucendo* principle, because there is no furniture in them. Only to-day I became acquainted with a Jewess, a very respectable woman, who has one of those furnished rooms; respectable, I mean, as far as her character goes, but in a most miserable condition, her husband afflicted by the vice which is the cause of such an immense amount of distress amongst them, not drinking, as it is amongst the Gentiles, but gambling.

7921. That is a common vice amongst the Jews?
Amongst those foreigners.

7922. Do they spread it among the Gentiles?
No, because they keep so much apart.

7923. *Chairman.*] I might just ask you one question in reference to your saying that these people you referred to were not allowed to land again in Hamburg; I understand that that is not of your own personal knowledge?
No.

7924. You are not aware whether there are any laws or regulations which would prevent such immigrants being received in Hamburg?
I am not.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

10*th July* 1888.

MR. SAMUEL MONTAGU (a Member of the House of Commons), having been sworn; is Examined, as follows:

7925. *Chairman.*] YOU are Member of Parliament for Whitechapel?
For the Whitechapel division of the Tower Hamlets.

7926. You have heard what Dr. Billing has said as to his having made a mistake in mentioning your name in connection with this transaction; have you anything you wish to add on that point?
Yes. I am glad he has withdrawn that statement as far as I am personally concerned; of course there is no foundation for it; but if he maintains that the incident did occur, it is a serious charge against the Trustees of the Mansion House Russian Jews' Fund of which I am the treasurer; and I do not believe that it could possibly have occurred without its reaching us.

7927. Does his statement refer to the Mansion House Fund?
Well, our committee was entrusted with a large sum of money subscribed to be expended for the permanent benefit of Russian refugees, and our committee and the conjoint Russian committee of the Jewish Board of Guardians took cognisance of all arrivals of importance. They were met, taken charge of, and sent forward to America as a rule. No one would have sent back to Hamburg, or anywhere else, a number of immigrants, without certain knowlegdge that they would be received there.

7928. I do not think the case mentioned by Dr. Billing refers to the Mansion House Fund. In any case the information he has received is second-hand, and he does not vouch for its correctness himself. He has told the Committee that his informant is not now in the country; and as I understand you you wish to tell the Committee that none of the money entrusted to you from the Mansion House Fund was employed in sending these people back to Germany?
Dr. Billing does not give any dates, and it is a very vague statement altogether. I am sorry to hear, and therefore it is difficult to meet; but I have a balance-sheet here of the Mansion House Russian Jews' Fund. We had plenty of money available to send them to America, and no one would venture to send them back to Hamburg, unless we had verified the cases, and seen whether we could send them home by a through ticket to Russia or send them on to America. We have sent many thousands direct to the United States of America. If you wish to receive evidence as to the qualifications of the Russian immigrants that we have sent to America where we have founded agricultural colonies for them, I can give you that evidence.

7929. I do not think that that comes within our scope; but can you tell the Committee, of your own knowledge, whether there is anything in the laws and regulations of Hamburg that would prevent the immigrants spoken of being received there?
There has been a Return issued of replies from the Continent with regard to destitute aliens. There is one, No. 8, from Mr. Scott to the Marquis of Salisbury, dated Berlin, 4th May 1887, in which it says: "I have made the necessary inquiries, and have now the honour to report that there is no Imperial or Prussian law prohibiting the admission into this country of destitute aliens." I think that the case could not have occurred without some of us hearing of it and preventing it. The sting of the charge is that they were brought back again and shunted on our shores; that is what I wish to contradict, for I do not believe that anybody could have done such a thing.

7930. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] What makes you say "shunted on our shores"?
Dr. Billing in his first evidence not only made the statement which he has been good enough to withdraw quite completely and quite satisfactorily, but also he stated later on that when they were left at Hamburg they were brought back here and shunted upon our shores; that is his answer to numbers 5115 and 5116.

 7931. *Chairman.*]

7931. *Chairman.*] "(*Q.*) What became of the people who were taken back to Hamburg?—(*A.*) They came back here again. (*Q.*) And were discharged after all upon our shores?—(*A.*) Yes." That is the evidence you refer to?
Yes; that I do not think was possible.

7932. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] Is there any reproach to anyone there?
Yes, a great reproach, because at the time when the immigration was large which it was in the years 1882, 1883, and 1884, it was our duty to meet these immigrants and to see that they were lodged and sent forward to America with the money that was subscribed, about 80,000 *l.* odd.

7933. But it is not stated by Dr. Billing that they were not well looked after when they were put upon our shore. I understood his answer merely to refer to the fact that they were brought back here?
But the suggestion is that they were retained here, and I maintain if they had come they would have been forwarded to America, where we have sent a great many thousands.

7934. *Chairman.*] To your knowledge were any foreign immigrants here sent back to Hamburg or other parts of Germany?
There were cases of unfit emigrants being sent home through the board of guardians, but I believe their invariable habit is to send them by a direct ticket to their homes, and we had plenty of money to do it.

7935. Through Hamburg to their own country?
Yes, and not to risk their remaining at Hamburg.

7936. And, to your knowledge, were any of them not allowed to land at Hamburg?
No, they did not refuse them. There might be an isolated case coming back, but never any sent back.

7937. Lord *Thring.*] Have you sufficient knowledge to state in evidence if any considerable number of emigrants have been sent back again from Hamburg, or any part of the Continent, into England; have immigrants into England sent to Germany or Russia been sent back again, within your knowledge?
I feel perfectly confident that it did not occur, but of course, to prove the negative, I should like to have the dates, that I might prove it categorically.

7938. Your knowledge is so good that, in all human probability, it could not have occurred without your knowing it?
That is so.

7939. *Chairman.*] Have you anything else you wish to say?
There are one or two statements also in the evidence with regard to there being an organisation to bring people over; that was suggested, and also with reference to there being a prejudice against the Jews in my constituency of Whitechapel, and their mode of living, if that is a subject you would like to take evidence upon.

7940. I think we have had a great deal of evidence from the Jewish Board of Guardians on those points, and I do not think we need trouble you with anything further?
My experience of over 30 years is that there is not that prejudice at all, and there has been no complaint from the different Jewish organisations with which I am connected, or the Jewish working classes, with whom I constantly in contact; I have never heard of any unfriendly relations.

7941. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] I dare say you observed with reference to the statement which was inadvertently made by Dr. Billing concerning the taking back of a body of immigrants, the inference would be that the funds for that purpose were not the funds of the society but private funds of some individuals?

I cannot

I cannot conceive the possibility. No body of emigrants would go back if they were told to go back; it would require great force and compulsion, I think. The whole thing seems to be perfectly imaginary.

7942. I suppose, as the statement was made, the inference would be that the funds, if funds had been used, were not those of the society, but of an individual?
The statement at first was that I had supplied the fund.

7943. But that has been withdrawn now; the inference was not that the funds were those of the society?
But there was money of our society available for quite the contrary purpose; that of sending them to America.

7944. Was not the inference that it was an individual contribution, not one from the funds of the society?
It may be so.

7945. Lord *Thring.*] In your opinion it is very unlikely that there should have been an individual contribution to send people back to Germany when you had money to send them on to America?
Quite so. We have many thousands of pounds still left.

MR. EDWARD MADDEN, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

7946. *Chairman.*] You are the Secretary of the East London Branch of the Amalgamated Society of Tailors, are you not?
Yes.

7947. And you live in the East-end of London?
Yes.

7948. How long have you lived there?
About 16 years.

7949. And I suppose you are intimately acquainted with the condition, not only of the members of your own Society, but of your trade generally, in that part of London?
Yes.

7950. Have you anything prepared that you wish to state to the Committee?
We have got 54 members in the branch to which I am secretary.

7951. This is a society of which the branches extend all over the United Kingdom?
All over the United Kingdom; but with regard to this branch, in a neighbourhood where there is so much tailoring done, the smallness of our numbers must of necessity strike your Lordships, because it would follow that where there is so much tailoring done, a good many men might be resident there, Englishmen and Irishmen, for the purpose of joining our society; but such is not the case. The employers, as a whole, in the City have no workshops, and the majority of the work goes into the hands of sweaters, and excludes as a whole the majority English, the Irish, and Scotch men from the tailoring trade in the East-end of London to a great extent. There are only a few shops in the City where men are employed indoors, and that accounts for the smallness of our number of members. The employers can do with a middleman or sweater, and will have them in preference to us men. The reason is that they work at a cheaper rate than that we do, and they work longer hours, and it is almost impossible for us to get a living in the way we have got to work at the present time. I have got some evidence here to lay before you respecting the factories connected with the Government contracts.

7952. Do you mean the factories that execute Government contracts?
The factories that execute Government contracts; one is Mr. Hebbert, of Bethnal Green-road. This gentleman employs a great many people on his own premises, and after the day is finished, many of these people take the work from that place to their own homes.

7953. Do you mean men?
Men and women. They give the work out of doors, and in looking over the people who work for them out of doors I find one trouser-maker, a woman, finishing for 7 *s.* a-dozen, trousers belonging to Her Majesty's Customs.

7954. You have told the Committee that the people who work in this factory take their work home, and you have spoken of people who work out of doors; do you distinguish between the two?
We consider the people who work in the factory in the shop, as working out of doors; but the persons working at home we consider home workers.

7955. When speaking, therefore, of the home worker, you mean a person who is not working in the factory at all?
Not working in the factory at all.

7956. Not at any time of the day?
Not at any time of the day. This woman that I have seen got 7 *s.* for finishing Her Majesty's Customs' trousers, 7 *s.* per dozen; and it would take an expert four or five hours to finish one pair of them; she could not finish a pair in less, and 7 *s.* per dozen she received for these trousers. Then there is a gentleman by the name of Templinski; this gentleman makes trousers for 11 *s.* per dozen as a whole: takes them from Hebbert's factory, and completes them as a whole for 11 *s.* a dozen.

7957. Earl of *Onslow.*] What sort of trousers?
I should take them to belong to the Post Office, from what I have seen.

7958. *Chairman.*] Can you tell us how they are marked, or how you recognise them as Government trousers?
I have not been able to see these trousers myself; but the only pair I have seen was in the case of this woman whom I called to visit.

7959. Earl of *Onslow.*] Could you give the date?
It occurred somewhere about last April, early in April, when I called to see her. Mr. Templinski works the sweating system to such an extent as to make a good living out of the female workers, for whose truthfulness I can vouch.

7960. *Chairman.*] I suppose you could give the Committee the names of these women if required?
Yes, I can give that if it is required. Mr. Bamberger, of Leman-street, Whitechapel, contracts with Her Majesty's Government, and makes the Post Office coats. He sub-lets this to several people, but two in particular, that I can name; if it is required I can give their names and addresses.

7961. Earl of *Onslow.*] Sub-lets the Government contracts?
Sub-lets them; he gives them out of doors to be made, the Post Office clothing, and these are made under conditions which are anything but healthy, because in most of the homes which I have visited to see where the work was made they were to be considered anything but a workshop. For these Post Office coats Mr. Bamberger pays from 2 *s.* to 2 *s.* 3 *d.* to get them made as a whole out of doors; and the man has to find his own sewing, trimmings, fire, and lights.

7962. *Chairman.*] Do you know what Mr. Bamberger gets for them?
I do not. This Mr. Bamberger has many women and men employed on his premises; and after eight o'clock in the evening, when their time has come to leave, the work is shifted by these men and taken to their own homes, and they sit up mostly all night to get a living at this particular branch of the labour. The conditions under which the people live are anything but satisfactory. Mr. Knights, of Old Ford-road, is not a Government contractor that I am aware of.

This

This gentleman evades the Factory Act; he gets the machine work done on his own premises and gives out the garments to be finished.

7963. As far as possible you had better avoid mentioning names, unless they have reference to Government contracts?
I do not know that I can avoid it.

7964. You can give the names to the Committee if you like?
The women employed out of doors receive, for finishing jackets, 1½ *d.* each. It would take an expert from a practical point of view, from which I have looked at it, fully an hour to finish one of these jackets. She has to complete it for 1½ *d.*, and she has to find her own sewing trimmings to do them. The reason why I refer to this is, because they evade the Factory Act; they shift the work that might be done in the factory to the homesteads of these people; they supply what we call domestic sweating, which we consider to be one of the greatest evils connected with our trade. These women who take the work (although I have no authority for saying so from these particular persons I have made enquiries of, but from what I have seen in other cases), take a lot of little girls with the intention of teaching them the trade, but teach them nothing, and ruin these children who go to them; and I believe in most cases in Mr. Knight's factory such things are really done, because it must be done to try to get a living at the work.

7965. Lord *Thring.*] What do you mean by "ruining" the children?
When I use that expression, I want to be understood that it ruins them as far as labour is concerned, because they are not really taught the trade that their parents think they are going to learn. I do not mean you to infer that it is morally. There are juvenile suit hands employed by this factory who receive the juvenile suits out to finish after the machinery is done on the premises. They receive 3*s.* and 3 *s.* 6 *d.* per dozen suits for finishing these juvenile suits. One woman that I spoke to myself told me that she must work night and day to make a living; and after hard work she can make about four dozen suits in the week, which would leave her, after finding her trimmings, about 6 *s.* for the whole of her week's labour. She stated that it was worse than slavery, and she wished that something could be done for the purpose of preventing it. She thought if she had learnt the trade as a whole and became more practical she would be more independent and could demand a wage. In my investigations I find that most of the people grumble at being only partly taught the trade, and we believe it is the mainspring of the whole evil; because many parents who are not acquainted with the tailoring trade believe that by putting their children with some of these middlemen they are going to teach them the trade as a whole, and after spending their time with these middlemen they are turned out only partly able to do, and very badly some of them able to do, anything at all connected with the tailoring trade. As far as my experience has led me I think in a few years more practical tailors will be very difficult to get, unless something is done to save them. We have used every means in our power reasonably with the employers to define a day's work, and to try and come to an understanding with them.

7966. *Chairman.*] What do you mean by employers?
I mean the employers carrying on the legitimate tailoring trade.

7967. That is in the East-end?
In the East-end.

7968. What do you mean by the legitimate tailoring trade?
The bespoke trade of the shops in the City. In order to arrive at an understanding with our employers, in 1883 we introduced what was called a uniform time log, and submitted it to the employers for the purpose of trying to meet them half way with the view of combating this great evil; because we could see from our experience that something must be done, or else the trade must virtually pass out of the hands of Englishmen as a whole, and they be supplanted by other people. It would be a question whether that would be an improvement or not, but it is a big question. The employers refused to meet us

us to discuss relations with us. With one exception, and out of the whole of London, Mr. Sandilands, of Conduit-street, was the only gentleman, the only master tailor, who offered to meet the men on fair terms, with a view of suppressing this evil. Now, in order to show you that they are going to destroy us as a whole, I have taken the "Daily Telegraph" and the advertisements in it, and I find these advertisements appearing.

7969. What is the date of that paper in your hand?

Monday, the 11th June: "To tailors (Germans). Good ladies' jacket and body hands wanted. Good wages, constant work. Apply to B. C. Colls and Company, Tunbridge Wells."

7970. What do you deduce from that?

I take it that the men who should be working in London have migrated into local towns; the majority of our men have migrated into these local towns with the view of being able to get a better living than in London. It used to be formerly the case for a man to come to London to become more practical in his trade; but now we find that the London men have to go into the provinces to become practical in the trade. I do not wish you to infer that we have no practical men in London; we have as many as ever; but the difficulty to my own mind in men coming into London and getting a living is so great that they will not come, because the provincial towns are far better; but the employers in the provincial towns see that it is necessary to introduce the middleman, and although this advertisement refers to the Germans, I have great reason to believe that it means the sweater, to introduce him to Tunbridge Wells, and destroy the people there who have got to make a living out of it. I find another advertisement in the "Daily Telegraph," of Friday, the 4th May: "To ladies' tailors. Wanted one or two first class ladies' tailors to take charge of a workshop in a large provincial town, and to be responsible for making and finishing the work, employing their own assistants; foreigners preferred. Address, in first instance, giving full particulars, L. M., Box 3143, Postal Department, 'Daily Telegraph,' Fleet-street, E.C." There can be no doubt as to a sweater being wanted. Here we have all these difficulties and obstacles in our way, as far as both the West-end and City are concerned, because the legitimate masters in the City, as I have stated before, will have these men; and there are great doubts in our mind that all that they do is not legitimate. In many instances foremen are known to call at these men's places. The foreman goes there, but what he goes for we cannot see definitely, but there are great doubts in our mind as to the honesty of his intentions towards these men. I do not say that all foremen do this; but in most cases we find it confined to show shops where tickets are put on garments in the window. The men who are foremen in the particular shops, as a rule, are not practical tailors; these men learn cutting, and having no moral responsibility held over them for the trade, and having no respect for the trade, they use the foreigner as the readiest tool to carry out their design, and we believe that their intentions are not altogether honest either to their employers or to us.

7971. How do you mean by "not altogether honest"?

Of course it would not do for me to introduce a speculative opinion; we have no direct evidence to bring any guilt against these men directly; there is only one particular case that I have known of myself, where a bribe was offered to one man, and it was a gentleman employed by Mr. Kino by the name of White. He went under the name of White; but whether that was his name or not I am not in a position to say?

7972. I want to know what you had in your mind when you spoke of not behaving honestly; what do you consider to be dishonest?

I allude to the foreigner; not the legitimate foreigner; we have no quarrel with him that is a practical tailor, but we quarrel with the middlemen who practically are no tailors, and know nothing at all about it. They learn a particular branch of it, and they get the work, for whatever reason they get it we cannot state, but they get the work wholesale, and we, as a class, are twice as well

well able to carry on this sort of business as they are; but we held ourselves responsible for any evils that might arise from our dealings; consequently we, as a class of English working people, refused having anything to do with it, with few exceptions; but these men have been taken by the foreman, and as soon as the foreman leaves one particular shop and goes to another, you will find these men following him round in dozens to get employment back from him.

7973. What do you mean by "these men"?
I mean the middlemen.

7974. Have you anything more you wish to state before I ask you some questions?
I think not.

7975. I understand you that you consider that the practice of men and women taking their work home from the factory is an evasion of the Factory Act?
Yes.

7976. I suppose you mean that it amounts to practically an evasion of the Factory Act?
Yes.

7977. Do you know whether the men and women working in these factories where the work is taken home afterwards, are compelled so to take the work home?
I could not say for certain that they are compelled, but they do it.

7978. Would you object to their doing it if they were not obliged to?
I should certainly think that a day's work of at least 12 hours is quite sufficient for any one to be able to get a living.

7979. Then you would object to a man, after working 12 hours in the factory, taking work home to do if he chose?
Yes, I would.

7980. And you would object equally, I suppose, to a woman doing it?
I would object more so to a woman doing it, considering that she is not constitutionally able to stand it as well as the man. I would take it for granted that common decency would say that she ought to refuse it.

7980*. And you think that the law having regulated the hours for work for women, the law is practically evaded if the woman is allowed, after having worked her full time at the factory, to work extra hours at home?
I do.

7981. Can you tell the Committee whether from your experience the state of things that you complain of has tended to get worse or better during the last few years?
It has tended to get worse, and the reason why I think it has tended to get worse is the great difficulty with which our members can actually pay their contributions, and the employers find our members dependent on them, not only themselves, but their families through their working at home; the employers know of necessity that the whole family is dependent upon them, and the employers will take every advantage for the purpose of reducing the man's wages; the employer knows that the whole of the family are employed by the man, and they will use every means in their power to lower the position of the man.

7982. I gather from you that in your opinion there is a migration of the higher class of labour in the trade from London into the provinces?
Yes, there is.

7983. And also that the native-born people are being supplanted by foreigners?
Yes; not by tailor foreigners, it is by people who are really not tailors. The foreign

foreign tailor is in as bad a position in many instances as we really are. The legitimate foreign tailor is in many instances quite as badly off as we are; it is the middleman who by this system called sweating is really supplanting us.

7984. I was told the other day by a West-end tailor that whereas formerly some of their best hands, a great number of their best hands, were Irishmen; now the Irishmen have left the trade practically, and their places have been taken by Germans; is that the case within your knowledge?

I think myself I could explain that to you. In Ireland our trade is better regulated and better governed. The masters in Ireland feel that they have a moral obligation, that they are bound down by a moral obligation to their workmen and customers; the men equally so. We, on our part, have endeavoured to do what we could, our Amalgamated Society of Tailors; but in Ireland the workmen all belong to this Amalgamated Society in the large towns, and in a great portion of our small towns. These men have a defined time, and they work about 10 or 11 hours a day; and should a dispute arise between any man and his master, it is submitted to the Board of Employers, and a deputation from the men go and meet the employers and settle any grievance that might arise in a town or place. I have only known one case where it failed, and that only for a short time; that was in Dublin.

7985. In your opinion, labour is better organised in Ireland than in Great Britain?

It is better organised.

7986. And that is the reason why there are not so many Irishmen now in London working as tailors?

Yes, because it is worse than slavery. I, as an Irishman, would prefer going back there if I could get a living there; but after being 22 years away from it I do not consider it would be wise for me to go back.

7987. You spoke of these Government contracts; the trousers, I think you said, made for the Post Office?

Yes.

7988. And the other clothes made for the Custom House?

Yes.

7989. How do you know that they were for the Post Office and the Custom House?

From what I have seen of the Customs. When the trousers which were put into my hands by this lady, I saw marks with white letters inside, H. M. Customs, that led me to believe that was Her Majesty's Customs, white-edged blue cloth.

7990. Then as to the Post Office?

I forgot to mention Sandhurst College also.

7991. We will keep to the Post Office; how do you know that the clothing was for the Post Office?

Nothing else would lead me to believe it but what I have seen them wearing in the street; I, as a tailor, would know that they were the Post Office clothes: but the men told me that they were the Post Office clothing.

7992. What do you wish to say about Sandhurst?

That the coats made for servants in Sandhurst College, with red collars and cuffs, were made in one of these sweating dens, and the gentleman stated to me that he got 6 *s.* for them; but I understood afterwards that they got 5 *s.* 9 *d.* for them. In Sandhurst or in Blackwater they pay about 15 *s.* to make them there; so the trade has migrated from there; and it has a tendency to centralise them as a rule.

7993. Who is the contractor who takes the orders; where does he get them from?

He did not tell me where he got them from.

7994. Lord

7994. Lord *Sandhurst.*] Are these things made at 5 *s.* 9 *d.*, tunics?
No, the regular dress-coat, with red cuffs and red collar on it.

7995. And 5 *s.* 9 *d.* was the price?
The price for making it; it would take any practical tailor three days to make it.

7996. Earl of *Onslow.*] You say that the Post Office clothing which was put out by Hebbert was in April in this year?
Yes.

7997. Do you happen to know at what period the contract for that would have been put out by the Government?
I think the Government put out their contracts in April.

7998. The same month?
I think so.

7999. Both Messrs. Hebbert and Messrs. Bamberger have factories, have they not, of their own?
Yes.

8000. In which, at any rate, the greater part of the Government work is done?
Yes.

8001. I suppose that the reason they put the work out is because they took more work to do than they could possibly manufacture upon their premises?
Yes, I daresay that is one of the reasons.

8002. I presume that, whether they do the Government work on the premises and put their private work out, or do their private work on the premises and put the Government work out, the evils of sweating would be the same?
Just the same.

8003. Therefore, in order to arrive at any remedy, it would be necessary to provide that they should do all their work, both the Government work and the private work, in the factory?
As a whole, on the premises; but that should be subject to conditions; because you see here, according to their advertisements, the foreigner is preferred, as a ready tool to be shoved in here for the purpose of carrying on the same evil as we have to combat. And these men, as a rule, do nothing for the society. I believe they have formed some sort of a society called the Master Tailors' Mutual Society, but their benefits are so limited that it is merely between themselves; whilst our society embraces men of all classes, so long as they are only honest and legitimate tailors, and willing to act upon honest principles; but as soon as they become dishonest, we put them outside our association. There is one special clause connected with our rules which I think should be known, to show what we offer to the public as a safeguard; and I think myself that employers ought to be a little more modified in their dealing towards us to what they really are, both in the West-end and City. Rule XI., Section 2, is this: "That in all cases where a member is prevented from following his employment by the medical or sanitary authorities, in consequence of some member or members of his family suffering from infectious disease, the committee of the branch shall investigate the case and medical certificate. They shall have power to grant lock-out pay to the member. The secretary shall send a full report within seven days to the Executive Council, who shall have power to grant such other payment as may meet the case, until the medical officer certifies that his family is free from infection." The amount payable under this section is limited, that is, 15 *s.* a week; but should the executive consider that it is not sufficient to meet the case, they have power to grant more.

8004. Would the object of that clause be to prevent work being taken out at a time when a member of the family was suffering from infectious disease?
Yes; our members would not be likely persons, seeing that we protect them and

and the public at the same time, to take the work out of doors, seeing that they would get this protection.

8005. Do you believe that infectious disease is spread to any great extent by making coats in sweaters' dens?

If that does not spread it I would like to know what does; I know nothing more likely to spread it.

8006. To return to the question of Government contracts, have you ever considered what proportion of the total amount of Government clothing is made in the factories in the East-end?

I have no idea; I have never calculated.

8007. You are aware that the Government have very large factories of their own?

Yes.

8008. You have no ground for saying that the makers in the East-end evade the Factory Act directly?

Do I understand you to mean the middleman, the sweater.

8009. No, I mean the contractor?

Well, Mr. Bamberger must of necessity know, because the people take the work out at night-time.

8010. But under the Factory Act it is not an offence to take the work home; I ask you whether, in any other respect, you think the contractors evade the Act?

I have no knowledge that Mr. Bamberger evades the Factory Act, but we believe that the Factory Act ought to follow those people to their homesteads, seeing that they remove this work from the factory, and to hold the employer responsible for these people working at their homesteads.

8011. Earl of *Derby*.] I understand you object to either men or women taking work to do at home?

I object to men or women taking work home out of the factory at night time, after completing their day's work.

8012. How do you suppose it would be possible to follow them to their homes to see that they did not do extra work?

I should think it ought to be the duty of the employer who employs these people to see that they do not shift that work as far as he can prevent it; but in most cases they do nothing to prevent it.

8013. Would you hold the employer responsible for what the workman or woman may do in their own home?

It would be undesirable, I should hold, where a man or woman might be able to take a quantity of work which could not really be observed; I would not hold the employer responsible after he had done his best to prevent it; but where large quantities had been shifted, I certainly should hold him responsible for it.

8014. You spoke of the migration of labour to the provinces; did I understand you to mention that as a thing to be objected to?

Well, it is not to be objected to, only we do not consider that it is right that unpractical men should come and take the place of practical tailors, and send them away into some other town where they are already overrun; because in most of our provincial towns there are plenty of tailors there, and we want more of our good workmen in London, because there is more work in London than seven times the practical tailors we have in London could really do. According to the calculation I made in 1885, I see that it wants about 99,000 tailors to make the work for about 4½ millions of the people, considering one-fifth to become eligible to wear the clothes that we make.

8015. *Chairman*.] You mean that 99,000 tailors are required to make the clothes for the population of London on the supposition that one fifth of them wear the kind of clothes made by the tailors?

Yes.

8016. What

8016. What would the four-fifths wear?
It was put in this form: that they were women and children, and I thought that the proportion of the males was less than the females.

8017. By the one-fifth you mean the adult male population?
Yes.

8018. Earl of *Derby*.] You say that there is work enough for all the tailors in London if some condition were supplied which is at present wanting; what is the condition?
If we have workshops in and around London there would be plenty of labour for every man.

8019. But if a man prefers going to some country place (you mentioned Tunbridge Wells, I think) what is the objection to doing it there?
We are compelled to send them there very often; we have to give them travelling cards very often in the slack season. Whilst the middleman is getting any quantity of connection, we have to supply our men; our men have to break up their homes, and they have to go and seek labour in cold and damp weather. We pay about 2,000 *l.* a year to our members travelling, going from town to town, and a good many of these men are forced to go from London and we give them a travelling card. They receive 3 *l.* 6 *s.* 8 *d.* for travelling for 50 days during the year.

8020. Why are they forced to go from London?
Because there is no work for them.

8021. And there is work in the country places?
They will go and see where they can get a day's work. In a country town they may be able to get two days' work, and then to travel 50 miles again. And the death-rate in our society is very often increased from the mere fact of these men travelling about in the damp season of the year.

8022. Then I do not understand how your remedy would apply by establishing workshops all round London; do you mean in addition to those existing?
I would like to see those that exist at the present time under the sweater swept away altogether, or bound by some condition that they could not extend them; for those people have no respect even for a small space given to them by their landlord, such as a yard with a little bit of garden; they build a large workshop in it, and by this means they make the rent of the house 10 *s.* a week more, by reason of this workshop in the yard.

8023. I gather that your object is, as you stated, to do away with all work that is done other than in a workshop?
Yes.

8024. And to have it all under public inspection?
Yes.

8025. And to put an end to work done at home?
If we cannot very well grapple with the thing in any other way. I do not think our men would have any real objection against going into the shops, provided we cannot deal with the thing in any other form; but if we had registration of these workshops, I think that would meet the case to a great extent.

8026. Does it not often happen that women whose husbands have employment assist the family to live by taking, on their own account, some work of the kind you have mentioned?
Some women do.

8027. Do you object to that?
I would object to nothing that would be done honestly and justly. I do believe that these women are compelled to do it for many reasons which are brought about by a state of things I really cannot describe myself; but the women are compelled to do it because their wants are so great with their

families that they cannot meet all demands unless they can help their husbands, and it is the only means supplied to them of doing so.

8028. Do you think it would be just to cut them off from that means of living?

I, as an individual, would certainly not advise that.

8029. Lord *Clinton.*] You mentioned just now the name of Mr. Sandilands as being ready to meet the men; what men did you men?

The members of our association.

8030. How do you mean to "meet" them?

We introduced a uniform time-log with a view of fixing a fair limit of time to a particular garment, because London as a whole has no time-log. Mr. Sandilands out of the whole of the masters in the City and West-end was the only one who came to meet the representatives of the men?

8031. Mr. Sandilands is a West-end tailor; how would he have anything to do with the East-end of London?

The same class of tailors make in the West-end as in the City.

8032. Do you mean that Mr. Sandilands employs East London men in his own factory, or that he sends work to East London men?

He is the only employer in London who does not give one job out of doors.

8033. You mean he does not employ a middleman?

He never employed a middleman in his life. I think it is only justice to that gentleman to say that, because he has always met his men and the trade and the officials of our society with the greatest courtesy.

8034. Lord *Sandhurst.*] Would you explain shortly what you mean by a travelling card?

You will see, if you look at our book, that we give 1 *s.* 4 *d.* a day for 50 days when seeking employment.

8035. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] I suppose all the members of your society are journeymen tailors?

All practical journeymen, as far as we know.

8036. You complained that the young men are not able to learn their trade; how do you propose that they should learn their trade; because we are told that apprenticeship is going out of fashion?

Apprenticeship, as far as London is concerned, is, and more especially in London; I do not know of one legitimate apprentice, only in the hands of these middlemen. Being no tailors themselves, all they can do is to train their dupe into a portion of it. I consider these apprentices their dupes; if not, their parents really are their dupes; and these people would never become practical tailors.

8037. Would you mind answering my question; how you propose to teach the boys their trade?

I should have them taught under practical men.

8038. But what I mean is this: practical men will not take them, you have told us, and apprenticeship is going out of fashion?

Yes; but if we had workshops instead of what we have got, there would be no difficulty at all about our apprenticing them. I work in a shop myself; I do not work at home; but I am not in a position to be able to take one of my own sons along with me to-morrow if he wanted to go. I would have to leave there, and come home to work, and the employer whom I worked for would not take on an apprentice because he has not room for him. But supposing we were to have a large number of workshops, there would be no difficulty in training our youth; and we can only depend for the future of our trade on Ireland, Scotland, and Wales to supply us with practical tailors.

8039. But even if you had workshops, would there not be a great objection on

on the part of the boys to go into those workshops upon a system of apprenticeship?

I do not think there would be. Some would object, but seeing that a great many are ready to go to the trade in our day as many would be ready then.

8040. Is not the difficulty this: that a boy can go to one of these middlemen where he is taught only one small branch of the trade, and after an apprenticeship of a few months he can earn and take home wages, whereas if he were apprenticed in one of these large workshops and had to learn his trade thoroughly, it would probably be at least two or three years before he could earn anything like the amount that he could earn by going to one of these middlemen?

Yes; but in looking at it from that point of view we would not at all take into consideration the future of our boys.

8041. But you would not get the boys?

But if the parents of those lads knew that they were only going to learn a portion of the trade they would never send their boys into the place at all.

8042. Lord *Monkswell.*] You said the death-rate was high in your portion of the society; what is it?

I am speaking of the whole of the society when I speak of the death-rate; if I were to speak of our branch we have unfortunately buried three this quarter.

8043. You say that the middleman is generally a man who is no tailor, and knows nothing about the work?

As a rule.

8044. We have been told that he does know the trade, or he would have been able to get on?

I take it on the evidence of one of these middlemen practical tailors, that is, Mr. Hanson, of Great Prescott-street, East. It is some years back, but I remember the meeting very well that Mr. Hanson attended to know if the Mutual Tailors Society, as they called it at the time, would be allowed to join our amalgamation. We would have no objection to receiving them, but they were not tailors according to the statement of Mr. Hanson; that is to say, the majority were not tailors. They had a man who had been a cigar maker for secretary, and a butcher was treasurer.

8045. You mean that middlemen applied to you to be taken on as members, but you refused them as they did not know their business?

Yes; the rules of our society deal specially with that, that no middleman sweater, or any man employed by the middleman, shall become a member of our society; we want to keep our trade distinct.

8046. Then you do not know of your own personal knowledge that middlemen know nothing of the business; you have heard that from somebody else?

I know several of them that are no tailors.

8047. Do you not know several who are?

I only know one, and I only know that he is from his own statement. We have no way of judging that unless they work in shops, and these men do not work in shops along with us men.

8048. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] Could you explain further your remarks about dependence upon Ireland, Scotland and Wales, for the future training of boys as tailors?

Scotland, and Ireland, and Wales take an especial interest in training the youth for this particular kind of industry, because in Ireland that is what a lad went to who wished to be considered a gentleman; in fact the only gentlemen in the town were the tailor and the parson; consequently the boy prided himself upon becoming some day a parson or a gentleman of some sort, and he had a great pride to learn that trade. But there are many inducements held out in Ireland from the way the men conduct their business there, and the way the

trade has been protected by our society in Ireland at all times to the boys to join that trade.

8049. *Chairman.*] Do you know at all where the clothing in the lunatic asylums is made up?
No, I do not.

8050. I think you spoke about the exceedingly bad sanitary condition of these sweating dens; the houses in which the work is carried on?
In most cases they are bad.

8051. I do not know whether you can give the Committee any information as to the food that these people subsist upon?
I think I had better leave that question out altogether. You will see from their earnings that they cannot afford a great deal.

8052. As I understood you, your contention is that what you call the legitimate trade in London is being superseded and driven out by what you call illegitimate trade?
That is so.

8053. And that consequently the legitimate trade in London is driven to apply for work in the provincial towns?
Yes; and if they can get to America they go there.

8054. And I understand also you object to work being done at home, principally, as I understood you, where the work is taken home from a factory in which the man or woman has already worked 12 hours?
Yes, I do.

8055. That you consider to be not a technical but a practical breach of the Factory Act, as far as women are concerned?
Yes.

8056. Earl of *Onslow.*] You said, in reply to the noble Lord on my right, that you wished to do all you could to discourage men and women taking work home with them after working hours; I want to ask you whether you think that something of your object might be gained if the employer were compelled to keep a register upon his premises of all the places to which he sent out work?
Well, that has been a notion of mine for years that that really ought to be done; that every man employing people indoors and outdoors ought to keep a register, so that a factory inspector could at all times see it.

8057. Is that opinion shared by the members of your society?
Yes, it is.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

WOOLF ZEITLIN, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

8058. *Chairman.*] You are the Secretary of the Jewish Branch of the Amalgamated Society of Tailors?
Yes.

8059. And where do you reside?
At 5, Joseph-street, Cannon-street-road, East.

8060. What is your trade?
Tailor.

8061. Are you working at the trade now?
Yes.

8062. Have you anything you wish to say to the Committee?

I am

I am going to refer to the Government contracts. They are twice sub-divided after the first hand. The first contractor from the Government lets out to a sub-contractor, and then the sub-contractor again lets out to the middle man.

8063. What contractor and sub-contractor do you allude to?
For the Government contracts; Post Office coats and other work that they do for the Government.

8064. You say that the Government put out their contracts for Post Office clothes, and so on, to whom?
To Mr. Hebbert and Company.

8065. And they sub-contract it again?
They sub-contract it again, and then the sub-contractor lets it again to the middleman.

8066. Do you know to whom they sub-contract it?
Yes; one was the name of Gerson, in the East end, Coberner-road, and then he let it to the middleman to make it.

8067. Can you speak as to the prices that were paid?
Yes. In former times they used to pay for the Post Office coats 2 *s.* 9 *d.* for making, and last year they reduced it to 2 *s.* a coat, and this year they signed agreements to make so many garments of each at the rate of 1 *s.* 8 *d.* a coat.

8068. Who signed the agreement?
The middleman with the contractor.

8069. The sub-contractor?
Yes.

8070. I understand that these are the prices for which the sub-contractor makes up the coats for the contractor who gets the contract from the Government?
Yes; the sub-contractor lets out the work to so-called small middlemen. They only carry on their business in a very small room, which is used for the home use as well. In one instance a case of small-pox was in the house, and the mother of the child did the button-holes for the Post Office coats.

8071. In the same room where the child was ill?
In the same room where the child was ill. She was only there for two or three days, and then she was taken to the hospital. They are engaging men and women at that work, and they are working all hours.

8072. Do you mean that the women are working long hours?
Yes.

8073. What length of time?
Fourteen or fifteen hours a day.

8074. In the shops of these middlemen?
In the shops of these middlemen. Since the factory inspector took the matter up, and prosecuted them for keeping them behind the time, they have found out a new scheme. They used to come in at eight, but now females come in at six or half-past six in the morning.

8075. You mean, instead of working two or three hours too late, they come in earlier in the morning?
Yes, they come in in the morning, because in the morning the inspector would not come there. Last Thursday I left home at a quarter-past six, and I met more than two dozen females going to work. The middleman make up a large amount of profits without hardly doing anything to the coats at all.

8076. How do you know that they are making large profits?
For instance, there is one man who made in a few years about 10,000 *l.* profit

out of the labour of men; when he retired from that business he sold his business to another middleman, and he took it for 170 *l.* for the connection.

8077. You say that some man made 10,000 *l.*; how do you know that?
That is estimated that it is about 10,000 *l.*, because he retired from business and lives in private.

8078. How do you know that he made 10,000 *l.*?
I do not know exactly, so is is estimated; people say he is worth about 10,000 *l.*

8079. How is the profit divided between the middleman and the people who work for him?
Some of them engage the people on piece-work, and the rule is that the working man gets a half of the price that the middleman gets from the shop; but we cannot tell whether he gets exactly a half, because the working man never knows how much the middleman gets for a coat, but the middleman tells him that he gets so much.

8080. The middleman, I understand you, takes half?
Yes.

8081. And for that he has to find the premises and light?
Yes, and machining and button-holes.

8082. And the material?
No, not the material; the material comes from the shop.

8083. But the thread, and so on, he has to find that?
Yes.

8084. And light and fire?
Yes; but the workman cannot tell whether that is exactly half of what the middleman gets from the shop, because he never shows the working man the tickets showing how much he gets for it; he only tells him so much. Some of them are engaged by the day.

8085. How are they paid?
The machiners and pressers are well paid; they get as much as 7 *s.* or 8 *s.* a day; but the other portion of the trade is very badly paid.

8086. Is it constant employment all the year round?
No; on the average it is no more than three days a week. In some places it is the rule to work 13 hours, but that is in a very small number; with the majority of them it is the rule to work 14 hours and some 15; but nobody can be very particular, because the middleman would discharge any man or woman who is particular as to the time.

8087. Do you mean that at these shops where they work 14 or 15 hours there are women working?
Yes.

8088. You are speaking of shops where women work?
Yes; women and men. There are no middlemen in the East-end of London who do not employ women. They are taking out work from the shops at half of the price that an Englishman gets in a shop for making, and they are as well made as the Englishman makes them. It takes them a good time to make a coat as good as the Englishmen, but as the men are working longer hours they can afford to make the garment as cheap as half of the price. In regard to what is called the third-class trade, they are all in the Jewish hands; of course the Englishman could not afford to do it.

8089. What do you call the third-class trade?
For export; the Englishman could not afford to do it, because no man except a machiner or presser can earn more than 3 *s.* or 4 *s.* a-day by it. In former times only women used to do this third-class work, no men; but since the sweating system has improved, it is taken away from the English women and men by the Jewish middleman.

8090. What

8090. What do you mean by the Sweating System having "improved?"
Since they came to the system for making it that each person should make a portion of the garment.

8091. By the word "improved," do you mean that it is better, in your opinion?
No, I mean that it is to a greater extent.

8092. You mean increased?
Yes. There is no tailor in the East-end of London who makes the whole garment by himself; it is sub-divided; one party does one part of the garment and another another.

8093. Can you tell us how many sub-divisions there are?
There are three machiners, two pressers, one baster, one felling hand, and one button-hole hand. The first machiner does not do what the second machiner does, and the second machiner does not do what the third machiner does, and the first presser does not do what the other presser does.

8094. What do you mean by garments?
Coats.

8095. The making of the coats would be sub-divided, according to you, into eight sub-divisions?
Eight or nine sub-divisions.

8096. Is that all in reference to the third-class work?
In reference to the third-class, and it has reference to all the classes, even the first-class trade, that is often sub-divided.

8097. What would you call second-class work?
That is stock work; and first-class work is orders for gentlemen.

8098. And does all that you have said apply to the second-class and to the first-class?
To all classes. There are no men in the East-end who do button-holes except those who are working in shops. If they are making the whole garments by themselves they are making the button-holes also by themselves; but in the East-end by the middlemen the women are engaged on the button-holes, and as a rule they must finish the work they have got to do, and therefore the button-holers have sometimes to start on Friday early in the morning and to work till Saturday dinner-time, right through the night.

8099. Have you anything more you wish to say?
The misery among the working class is to a very great extent. It is hardly possible to tell how they are living, men and females. There are some females who have only 1 *d.* or 1½ *d.* to spend for their dinner; the most is 2 *d.* A female, if she works the whole week, cannot earn more than 15 *s.* a week, but generally they are only working two or three days; so that she has 5 *s.* or 6 *s.* a week to live upon, and she cannot afford to spend any more for her food. Some of the tailors are making up so many garments which must be done in a day.

8100. Piece-work?
People working for day wages, they must make so many garments a day, and do not care when they are done; sometimes they can be done at twelve o'clock at night and sometimes at two o'clock the next morning; and that is only paid for as one day.

8101. What is the day supposed to be, how many hours?
Thirteen hours, as the rule; but they are working as much as 18, and then it is not paid more than as a day.

8102. I understand you that they get so much a day, for a day's work of 13 hours?
Yes.

8103. But they are supposed to turn out a certain amount of work; if they do not turn out that amount they must work overtime until they do?
Yes.

8104. For the same amount of wages?
Yes, the working men call it a day of 13 hours; but if the working men are working eight or nine hours they only get paid for half a day.

8105. You mean that eight or nine hours is considered half a day?
It is considered a half day. No overtime is ever paid to a man who works for a middleman; even if he works so many hours overtime during the week he never gets paid for it. There are some of the middlemen who have got a rule that so much must be done per hour, and if the men cannot possibly do it they are discharged. For instance, some of them have got a rule that four coats must be pressed off in an hour, and if the presser could not do those four coats in an hour he gets discharged.

8106. What do you consider to be a fair amount to be done in the hour?
Two. The man who works for the middleman can only work about 10 or 12 years; if he is a strong-built man he can only work 10 or 12 years, and afterwards he becomes useless.

8107. You mean from ill-health?
From ill-health; and he becomes a burden to society.

8108. He is broken-down?
He is broken-down. In some instances they are dropping down dead while they are at work.

8109. Do you mean that you know of such cases yourself?
Yes. In last February or March, in the last part of the winter, after January it was, a man had made six and a half days for one so-called middleman; it is one of the hardest places to work in in the East-end of London; and on the Friday night he went home at 10 o'clock and at 12 o'clock he was dead. He made half a day overtime in the week.

8110. How many hours a day?
He was working the whole hours, and he had to stop to make up more. He complained that he could not work, he was not well, and the middleman said he must, or else he would discharge him, and he was working till 10 on Friday night and came home, and two hours later he was dead.

8111. You said that he worked six and a half days in the six days?
Yes.

8112. Do you mean that he worked six days of 13 hours?
No; he made 14 hours, and then he gave him bastes to do, and he made up half a day with his bastes.

8113. Half a day in the week?
During the week half a day overtime; what he took home at night to do.

8114. You say he worked 14 hours a day every day for six days running?
Yes.

8115. And eight hours in addition?
Yes. I have not got anything more to say, because I have mentioned things in my statement. I refer to all classes of work; I refer to the Government contracts.

8116. Have you worked upon Government contracts?
I have stated so already. I have hardly got anything more to state.

8117. Have you worked, yourself, upon Government contracts?
Yes, I have.

8118. How did you know they were Government contracts?
I was working myself on them, for a sub-contractor.

8119. But

8119. But how did you know that the work was for the Government?
We can soon find that out; a tailor can find out what sort of a coat it is; he knows that a policeman does not wear a Post Office coat, and that a postman does not wear a police coat.

8120. Do you remember what the work was you did yourself?
Post Office tunics.

8121. How many members are there in your branch?
Twenty-five.

8122. The average life of a man working for these middlemen is, I think you said, about 10 or 12 years?
Yes.

8123. What becomes of them then?
They become useless to society; they become ill, cripples, and they are going about begging.

8124. How do they support themselves?
If the man has got friends, they make up a benefit and put him into a little business that he can live upon; and if not, he must go begging from house to house. The Jewish Board of Guardians assist him.

8124*. You talk about the women working overtime at night; you said that since the inspectors had commenced to prosecute these persons they put the women two or three hours earlier in the morning instead?
Yes.

8125. What did you mean by "since the inspectors began to prosecute;" when did they begin to prosecute?
That is about two years since; in the last two years the inspector took the matter in hand, when he prosecuted a great many, and they were fined in the police courts, so they are careful a little about that night-work, some of them, not all of them, because some of them are keeping them up in separate rooms, locking them up in a separate room, parlour, or kitchen, and the inspector goes up into the workroom and does not find any women there.

8126. You mean that the inspectors became more active two years ago than they were before?
Yes.

8127. And the result was that the masters were obliged to take precautions?
Yes.

8128. You told me that the other morning about six o'clock you met about two dozen women going to work?
Yes, and that just in a few streets.

8129. And you think that the Factory Acts are evaded?
Yes.

8130. To a large extent?
To a very great extent.

8131. You told us also that you thought it was necessary for the women button-holers to work long hours in order to keep pace with the rest of the work?
With the men; so long as the men work the button-holers must work.

8132. Do you think then that if the Factory Act, as far as regulating the hours of work for women, were enforced, it would tend also to shorten the hours for which the men work?
Yes.

8133. And it is your opinion, as I gather from you, that the piecemasters make too large a profit?
Yes;

Yes; even the day master is making a very large profit. I can prove an instance where a day master works four machinists, and has got as much as 22 *l.* or 23 *l.* a week profit.

8134. How is it that the people put up with these low prices that you complain of?
They could not help it. If a man has not anything to eat he must work at any rate that he gets.

8135. Has this state of things got worse in the last five or ten years?
Yes.

8136. How do you account for its getting worse?
Because there is not so much to do. In the former years there was a great deal more work to do than there is at present.

8137. Do you mean that there is not so much actual work, or not so much in proportion to the people?
There is not so much actual work; because they are making up the large amounts during the day, and that does not do for the next day.

8138. You mean because they are working longer?
Longer hours.

8139. And you say that the middlemen can make goods at half the price that they can be made in the factory, because they work longer hours?
Longer hours; they are paying the same price to the working men as they ought to take for shorter hours.

8140. They pay them the same price as they are paid in the factory, and make them work a great deal longer?
Yes.

8141. Do these middlemen work, themselves, as a rule?
Some of them do not work at all, and the great majority of them do not understand anything about tailoring at all.

8142. How do they get into these positions?
They become acquainted with a foreman or cutter, and then he supplies them with the work. The middleman gets good working men to do it for him, and so he brings in a good coat into the shop and the employer does not know whether he has made it himself or not, and he is called a tailor; but properly he should not be called a tailor at all.

8143. How does the middleman get his orders; does he go direct to the large house. He goes to the large house and gets it from the foreman?
From the foreman.

8144. You told us that the third-class work is altogether in the hands of Jews?
Yes.

8145. I think you said, because the Englishman could not do it at the price?
Yes.

8146. How is it the Jews will do it lower than the Englishman?
Because the Englishman does not work long hours as a rule, and then he spends a little more money during the week than the Jewish workers; therefore he could not stand it; even the Jewish workers, who are so economical, can hardly stand it; in the good seasons they can hardly make a living, but in the slack seasons they must apply for relief.

8147. The Jews can work longer hours and they spend less money than the English?
Yes.

8148. Therefore the third-class trade is getting into their hands?
Yes. The English worker also wants to enjoy a glass of beer, and the Jewish worker does without it.

8149. Earl

8149. Earl of *Onslow.*] You say that Messrs. Hibbert put out the Post Office contract to a sub-contractor?
Yes.

8150. Have you ever seen any of these coats actually being made by sub-contractors?
Yes.

8151. What sort of coats were they?
Post Office coats, overcoats.

8152. Post Office tunics?
Tunics and overcoats.

8153. When was that?
That was last year; but an agreement was signed this year as well to make them for 2 *s.* and 1 *s.* 8 *d.* a coat; but I have never yet seen them making them, because I have never happened to be in their shops.

8154. What time was it last year; in the beginning or the end?
About in April last.

8155 But you have no knowledge of any Post Office coat having been put out to a sub-contractor since April in last year?
April this year is when the contract was made; last April, I said.

8156. But do you know that the coat was made in April this year?
No, I do not know, because I never happened to be in their shops.

8157. You do not know whether the Post Office coat has been sub-contracted since April in last year?
Yes.

8158. Do you know that there is a clause in the Government contracts which precludes those who make the coats, who take the contracts, from making them anywhere except upon their own premises?
Yes, I do.

8159. With regard to this Factory Inspector's prosecution, when did it take place?
It took place in the last two years; it has been more effective since two years ago.

8160. And was the prosecution instituted because the owner of the factory sent work home, or because he employed the hands over hours?
Because he employed them over hours.

8161. In the factory?
In the workshops.

8162. I think you said that you saw two dozen women going to work at six o'clock in the morning?
Yes.

8163. And did you say that, in your opinion, that was a contravention of the Factory Act?
Yes.

8164. Is there anything in the Factory Act to prevent women from working at six o'clock in the morning?
But they ought to leave off at a certain time.

8165. How do you know that they did not leave off at a certain time?
They do not; no middleman lets his hands off before eight o'clock at night.

8166. Is there anything in the Factory Act to prevent the employment of a woman from six in the morning till eight in the evening?
I can hardly tell, because I am not so much acquainted with the Factory Act, but I know, as a rule, they ought only to work from eight to eight; but if they work from six to eight, it is an infraction of the Factory Act.

8167. Do you think that the Factory Act provides that women shall work only from eight to eight?
I thought so.

8168. Lord *Sandhurst.*] You told the Committee that your society consists of 25 members?
Yes.

8169. Does that association of yours belong merely to one particular district?
Yes, it belongs to the East Central district.

8170. It is a tailors' association, I understand?
Yes.

8171. And how many of them are there in that district?
I can hardly tell; there are about 500 or 600.

8172. At any rate 25 is a very small proportion of them?
It is a branch of the society.

8173. There is a very great amount of distress, as I understand, in your trade?
Yes.

8174. Amounting to absolute destitution?
Yes.

8175. Do the members of your association receive any relief from the Jewish Board of Guardians?
Yes, some of them.

8176. Can you tell us anything about it of your own personal knowledge?
One became relieved last Passover holidays. He had to take relief because he had no means to provide himself for the holidays, and he had to take relief from the Jewish Board of Gaardians.

8177. Is it the case that anybody finding himself in an extreme state of distress can invariably get relieved by the Jewish Board of Guardians?
Yes.

8178. *Chairman.*] These Jews you speak of; have they been long resident in this country, or have they lately arrived in this country?
Some have been here 12 or 15 years.

8179. Do you know whether they ever get relieved from the countries that they come from?
No; they do not get any relief from them.

8180. Do you know what length of time is allowed for meals for these women that work?
One hour per day for dinner, from one to two o'clock.

8181. They are not allowed any time for breakfast?
No; nor for tea.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. EDWARD M'LEOD, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

8182. *Chairman.*] ARE you President of the West London District of the Amalgamated Society of Journeymen Tailors?
Yes.

8183. Our

8183. Our inquiry is as to sweating in the East-end of London, as you know; can you speak as to the East-end?

The cases that I wish to lay before you more particularly are not exactly in the East-end; but we have traced them so near the margin of it as the High-street in the Borough, and though practically we have not traced work from the West-end into the East-end, yet we know that many East-end master sweaters come to a certain portion of the West-end and make trade there for the West-end. These cases that I particularly wish to lay before you are so near the boundary of the East-end that I think it would be valuable evidence. The cases more particularly are of sweating in connection with the Army and Navy Stores, Victoria-street, Westminster. The trousers are taken out from there in large quantities by a sweater of the name of Wilkie, living in the High-street, in the Borough. He is in the habit of making considerable quantities of trade, considerably under what is considered the legitimate price; from 8 *l.* to 10 *l.* a week he would receive in the worst time of trade, and considerably more in the busy time.

8184. How do you know these facts?

I have not been of my own personal knowledge in this man's place; but the next case that I come to I have taken the trouble to go into the place, and we have received the information from the manager of the department himself; because an agitation occurred among the men because they were so badly treated to get rid of the sweater.

8185. That is the next case; but what about this case?

I have not of my own eyesight seen the trade go into Wilkie's place in the High-street in the Borough; but a reliable messenger went from the society to his place and saw it there. The next case is the case of Marks, in Rose-street, Seven Dials. He takes out very large quantities of clothing; in fact it was through him that the agitation that I have referred to occurred in the beginning part of last year.

8186. Where was this agitation?

The men in the Army and Navy workshops were so badly employed that they called upon me as president of the branch, to hold a series of meetings to advise them what to do in the matter. They were practically, in many cases, on the verge of starvation, though working in the shops, by the fact of the trade going out in such large quantities. I advised them to see the managing directors, and to have an understanding with them, and to point out to them the great grievance that they suffered under, through being compelled to sit in the shop the whole day waiting for trade, and not getting anything like a fair share of their trade; not because the firm had no trade, but because it suited their convenience to send it away to the sweater. It was considered unfair by us to their customers, as they had good workshops in a sanitary condition, and the men were kept sitting still there while this work was sent away to Marks, and to Wilkie, and the customers are from time to time taken into the workshop by the managing directors and shown the workshop and told, "This is where we have our trade made," while the fact is that a part is sent to High-street, in the Borough, and a part to Rose-street, in Seven Dials.

8187. Have you any idea what proportion is made in the workshops of the Company?

Yes.

8188. What would it be?

In the busy time of the year from 50 to 60 men would be employed in the shops, and fairly supplied with work; but in the slacker portion of the year 48 men, and they would be very miserably supplied with work. Their wages in many cases only amount to a few shillings per week. When we came to investigate the amount of work received by the coat-making sweater, Marks, it was admitted by the managing directors that he had received 190 *l.* wages in the first 10 weeks of the year, which would be the worst part of the year for employment.

8189. Where did you get that fact from?

From the managing directors themselves; their own admission to the men, when the men went on a deputation to them; and they admitted that he had received this, and they promised to alter the condition of affairs, but instead of doing so, instead of receiving 190 *l.* in ten weeks, he receives from 40 *l.* to 50 *l.* a-week during the busy time.

8190. Do I understand that it was put an end to?

No; they promised to put an end to it in April last, but instead of doing so, it has actually increased.

8191. As I understand you, what you complain of, so far as regards the Army and Navy Stores, is that though they have got good workshops in proper sanitary condition on their own premises, they do not keep the men fully employed, but put their work out to persons commonly called sweaters, where the work is done under unsanitary conditions?

Quite so. One special grievance I would wish to point out is the hardship inflicted on the men that work inside the shops. Many men live a considerable distance from their employment; some even as far as Woolwich, some at Clapham, Penge, Battersea, long distances; they have to be there early hours in the morning, and though they have no work to do, they are supposed to be there at a reasonable hour in the morning waiting for trade, sometimes waiting days without trade: and they are not allowed to stitch for themselves, or to mend their children's clothes; when not employed for the company they must be practically idle; they are not allowed to sew a button on for themselves. Of course if there is no work the men do not expect it; but they certainly expect when there is trade that they should have a fair share; and the directors have distinctly broken their promise made to them in April of the present year.

8192. I do not think you have answered the question which I put a little while ago, if you knew what proportion of the work was done on the premises, and what put out; you told us how many men were employed on the premises; do not answer the question unless you know about it?

I could give an approximate answer. I should say possibly two-thirds of the trade might be done on the premises, and one-third made out; I am giving the largest portion inside.

8193. And that one-third which is put out is not put out because the men on the premises are fully occupied?

No; because at the time I have stated the men were practically idle.

8194. In your opinion, speaking generally, is a great deal of the West-end work put out and made up in the East-end of London?

As I explained at the beginning, I am not in a position to trace it to the East-end; but a great deal of the trade is made out. Many of the East-end workers save us the trouble of tracing them to the East-end by coming to the West-end, where they work under very nearly similar conditions.

8195. Earl of *Onslow.*] How are the men paid; are they paid by the piece or by time, the men engaged in the factory of the Army and Navy Stores?

They are paid piece-work.

8196. Do they enter into a contract with the directors of the Army and Navy Stores that they are to work for nobody else but the Stores?

Notices are written on the walls, in which it is distinctly objected to, that any man shall do any work for anybody except for the firm.

8197. Do I understand that the men came into the factory and sit there for a certain number of hours a day, and that unless work is given them to do, they are not paid for it?

No, they have no pay for it at the end of the week; they might have sat there a whole week, and they are not paid a farthing.

8198. Do they enter into a contract binding them to remain?

There is no specific contract, but the men are at certain periods of the year waiting against hope for work to be sent into the shop.

8199. Earl

8199. Earl of *Derby.*] Do you mean that men are kept there an indefinite time with no work to do, and not allowed to work for anybody else, and not paid?

The men have no pay whatever unless they are working for the firm; and they are not allowed to work for anybody else except the Stores while on the premises.

8200. And they are expected to come and wait for work?

Yes; they are not allowed to mend their own clothes; it is carried to that extent.

8201. I understood you to say that an increasing quantity of the work done at the Stores was sent out?

Yes.

8202. Is that in consequence of the business having increased, and there not being room, or not hands enough, available on the premises?

I worked there some years ago, but for some few years I have not worked there. At the time that I speak of the men were supposed to be kept employed, those men that worked indoors; if there was an overplus it was to be given to the outside people; but at the present time the great grievance is that the sweater gets the work to the detriment of the man sitting in the shop, because, of course, when he does not work he has no pay.

8203. You put it in this way: that formerly sending out work to be done elsewhere was the exception, and now it is becoming less exceptional?

Yes.

8204. Lord *Clinton.*] Did any officers of the Army and Navy Stores know that you were going to give this evidence?

No.

8205. You have not given them any notice?

No.

8206. Do you mean to tell the Committee that these tailors are sitting in their factory doing nothing; that they know that work is being sent out, and yet they sit there and receive no wages?

They receive no wages, because it is a piece-work contract; and if they make a coat they receive the log price for it, and if they make none they receive no wages.

8207. At the same time the Army and Navy Stores work is going to the sweaters?

They see the sweater filling a big bag and taking away 10 or 20 coats at a time.

8208. And yet they remain in the employ of the Army and Navy Stores?

They do so.

8209. Earl of *Onslow.*] There is no contract to bind them to remain?

No, they are not slaves; they can go elsewhere if they can find employment elsewhere; but at many times of the year it is almost impossible to find trade. In my time there was always a distinct understanding that the men should be employed in the shop in preference to the sweater; and at that time they used to bring the customers into the shop and point out the sanitary accommodation.

8210. Lord *Sandhurst.*] Generally the trade is so slack that you do not think they can get employment elsewhere?

Many of them do leave through this system.

8211. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] Did the managing directors reply to the deputation that they paid as much as 190*l.* in 10 weeks?

Not the managing directors, but the manager of the tailoring department told them that they paid 190*l.* in the first 10 weeks of this year to Marks, and

75 *l.* to Wilkie, the trouser-maker, making a total of 265 *l.* in the first 10 weeks of this year; while the men in the shop were in many cases sitting idle.

8212. How was the other estimate obtained that you mentioned, namely, the estimate of 40 *l.* a week paid to a sweater?

Because I have taken some trouble to get as near as I possibly could to his wages since this arrangement was entered into between the directors and the men, and from information I have received I have understated it rather than overstated it.

8213. Then the second piece of information was not obtained, I understand, from the manager of the tailoring department?

No.

8214. But by other means?

By other means.

8215. Do you know anything of your own knowledge of the premises where the work is done outside?

Yes; I visited Mr. Mark's establishment.

8216. Is it satisfactorily arranged?

The approach is very bad; it is in a neighbourhood that is not noted for sanitary arrangements, and it is a small entry at the bottom of the stairs. There are some three or four flights of very dark stairs, so I really could not see the immediate surroundings; I was in perfect darkness till I got into his workshop; I had to grope my way upstairs.

8217. Are the workshops pretty good?

Fairly good.

8218. Not equal to those of the Stores?

Oh, dear, no.

8219. Do we understand that it is during the slack time of year chiefly that the men in the workshops of the stores are sitting idle during a considerable part of the time?

Yes.

8220. That is a time when they would not very easily get employment elsewhere?

That is so. One phase of the question I wish to point out is this: that though Marks was taking such large quantities when the men entered into this agitation to get rid of the sweaters, they did not propose to get Marks entirely discharged from the firm, but only to take such a quantity of work as would be for his own necessities, not to employ the class of people that he employs. The class of people that he employs are not so likely to have their domestic arrangements in a sanitary condition.

8221. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] The arrangement that the men should be in their places even when they are not at work is not an uncommon one in the trade; and I take it from you that the men would not object to that if they were certain of getting all the work that came into the shop?

The men quite understand the necessity of being in the shop to do the work; but they are rather more stringent at the Stores than they are in many places.

8222. Earl of *Onslow.*] Do you say that it is not an uncommon practice in the trade to be in the shop even when they are not at work?

It is not an uncommon practice for men to——

8223. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] I understood that the complaint of the men was that they were there waiting for the work in the shop, and that when it came in it was given out to sweaters instead of to them; that was what they complained of chiefly?

Yes. The Stores are stricter than this, that they expect a more regular attendance possibly; and when a man is unemployed for a time, he can mend his own clothes in other firms; or if he is able to obtain a little job from his acquaintences

acquaintances, he is able to do it while he is waiting for the firm's work; but at the Stores this is not allowed under any circumstances; he is perfectly idle.

8224. Lord *Monkswell.*] Generally he is not allowed to work for another person; that is the usual custom, is it not?
The usual custom is that he would be allowed to do any little job for himself or an acquaintance.

8225. But not for another firm?
No.

8226. He would not be allowed to employ his leisure in doing work for another firm?
No; then he would be using one employers fuel, and light, and gas, and things, to do other people's work.

8227. That would equally apply to mending his own clothes or his friend's clothes?
That would be so limited; he would not want to mend his own clothes every day, and would not have an opportunity of doing it for his friends every day.

8228. He might have a good many friends?
It would be fortunate if he had; he has a good deal of slack time.

8229. *Chairman.*] Do you know whether this work can be done cheaper when put out than it can be done by the Stores on their own premises?
As regards the case of Marks, I could not give an opinion whether he works cheaper than the men in the shop; but, as regards the trouser maker, I have information that he makes trousers at a considerable reduction of the log price agreed to at the Stores.

8230. And besides complaining that work is put out when the men are waiting for work on their own premises, you complain also that the customers believe that the trade is all done in properly conducted and sanitary workshops belonging to the company, whereas that is not the case?
I know they are given to understand so.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. JOHN HOLLEY, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

8231. *Chairman.*] You are the President of the Amalgamated Society of Tailors?
Yes.

8232. Does that society extend over the whole of the United Kingdom?
Yes, it does. There is also a Scottish National Association with, I believe, 2,000 members; but we have branches in Scotland as well.

8233. And in Ireland?
Yes; all over Ireland, Scotand, and Wales.

8234. Can you tell the Committee how many members there are in that society?
About 15,000.

8235. Do you give support in money to the various branches of the society if they require it?
The society is constituted to answer the whole of the purposes which are usually termed those in connection with friendly societies; besides trade purposes, it embraces the whole, sick, funeral, travelling, superannuation.

 8236. When

8236. When we heard a little while ago that one of these branches which numbered about 50 or 60 members spent a great deal of money in travelling cards, I suppose the funds for that would come from the whole body?

The funds are equalised every year so that at the beginning of each year each branch, in proportion to its number of members, starts equal.

8237. Is the membership restricted to any branch of the tailoring trade?

Our society is constructed on what might be best expressed as the local option principle; for instance, there are some towns where the outworkers are permitted to become members in contra-distinction to the middleman and sweater; in others, they are not allowed from the fact that there are scarcely any of them in the town; each branch is allowed to conduct its own business in its own way so far as membership is concerned.

8238. Have you anything you wish to say to the Committee?

By your permission I should like to just draw your attention to what we conceive to be some of the difficulties that we have very much to contend with, with special reference to the Factory and Workshop Act.

8239. You have heard the evidence which has been given by the three former witnesses?

Yes.

8240. Do you agree with it as far as regards the sweating system?

Taking into consideration what difference might exist with reference to the strong feeling that might arise in certain localities having special reference to the different classes of people residing there, there is no doubt the statement they have made about the sweating system as a whole is perfectly correct; as the reports reach us continually I do not think it is overstated at all.

8241. Would you agree that there was a migration from London into the provinces?

I could hardly go that far. I think it is travelling backwards and forwards continually.

8242. Labour naturally seeking employment?

Change.

8243. Perhaps you will tell the Committee what you wish to suggest?

In the first place we find considerable difficulty (now this has special reference to workshops) varying in degree according to whether they are first or second class. I would refer to Section 15 of the Act of 1878: "A workshop shall not be deemed to be conducted on the system of not employing therein either children or young persons until the occupier has served on an inspector notice of his intention to conduct his workshop on that system." Now we have made inquiries in some of the largest towns in England, Liverpool, for instance, and we cannot find one single instance where this has been carried into effect.

8244. You know we are not inquiring into the sweating system in any of the provinces, and unless this refers also to the East-end of London we could scarcely take it in evidence?

I believe wherever there are shops in existence it must refer to them all, for this reason, that wherever there are workshops (and there are many, I suppose, in the East-end of London; there are very few in the City, but a number in the West-end of London), unless this is carried out, it is taken for granted that they conduct their business wholly by male adults, and the inspector never visits them. Of course if I am not allowed to mention the provinces I must not do so; but it is more apparent in the provinces than perhaps it would be in the West-end of London.

8245. But it would refer to workshops generally?

Yes; it refers to workshops in this way: There are many second-class workshops, and in consequence of this not being carried out, they both employ young persons and women for long hours in consequence of the non-inspection, whereas

whereas if this were carried out it would be the means of placing them directly under the inspection of the Factory and Workshop Act.

8246. And what alteration would you suggest?
The enforcement of that. The 61st Section is in the same direction. I would suggest simply the enforcement; but with the present limited number of inspectors there is a great difficulty.

8247. You do not complain of the wording of the Act?
Not at all.

8248. But of the execution of the Act?
Yes; you find that the 61st Section is the same, a portion of it.

8249. Will you read it?
"Where the occupier of a workshop has served on an inspector notice of his intention to conduct that workshop on the system of not employing children or young persons therein, the workshop shall be deemed for all the purposes of this Act to be conducted on the said system until the occupier changes it, and no change shall be made until the occupier has served on the inspector notice of his intention to change the system, and until the change, a child or young person employed in the workshop shall be deemed to be employed contrary to the provisions of this Act." That has the same bearing as the other one I have read. I may state that the neglect of this portion of the Act being carried out is a cause of complaint, even with first-class employers as well as the men, because they know that in the absence of inspection, persons both employ young persons and women for those long hours where they are not being inspected, which they say placed them in a position of not being equal to compete with this kind of second-class trade, independent of the difficulty it presents to working men of not being able to compete with labour of that kind.

8250. In both these cases I understand you do not object to the wording of the Act?
Not in the slightest; I simply want the enforcement of it.

8251. You think the wording is quite sufficient to carry out the intention of the Act?
Quite so. Our next difficulty is the 69th Clause; as we understand it we use a common phrase, and we call it the Domestic Clause.

8252. Will you read it?
"An inspector before entering, in pursuance of the powers conferred by this Act, without the consent of the occupier, any room or place actually used as a dwelling as well as for a factory or workshop, shall, on an affidavit or statutory declaration of facts and reasons, obtain written authority so to do from a Secretary of State, or such warrant as is hereinafter mentioned from a justice of the peace. The affidavit or statutory declaration above mentioned may be inspected or produced in evidence in all respects the same as an information on oath before a justice." This, no matter whether it is in the East-end of London or in the West-end, is one of the great difficulties that prevent inspection. The inspector has sufficient difficulty in discovering these places; it is not a very easy task, because very often the middleman or sweater does nothing to indicate that he is carrying on a trade of that kind. Perhaps if you were to stand about the places for a time you might hear the din of the sewing machines going, but beyond that there is nothing to indicate that he is carrying on his trade. After the inspector has found this place, he knocks for admission. "What is your business?" "I am an inspector; you have a workshop; I want to inspect it." "Where is your authority?" Of course, the inspector has to leave the premises and go and seek for his authority from the Secretary of State, or make a statutory declaration before a magistrate to obtain the necessary warrant to visit this place. Of course, if there is anything wrong in the premises, for the time, at all events, it is removed, and if he had been in the habit of working women and young persons long and excessive hours, for a time that is suspended. So that what is intended to benefit us as a trade, at all

events, has the direct opposite effect, and simply protects the middleman as sweater.

8253. What would you suggest with reference to the 69th Clause?
The repeal of it.

8254. Do you mean that the inspector should have the right to enter any room where work is carried on?
Perhaps we are somewhat anticipating matters; but a registration clause would obviate the necessity for this as well. We do not mean that he should have the power to enter any house that he thought proper to go into; that is not our intention. Our idea is so far as possible to describe properly what is a workshop, whether it be in the man's house or any other place; but a registration clause would get rid of the difficulty, and obviate, we think, the necessity for the 69th clause.

8255. You think a workshop should be defined, and that those workshops should be inspected?
Yes.

8256. How would you define workshop?
We are prepared to take the definition already given in the Act as to what should constitute a workshop.

8257. Will you read it to us?
It is the last portion of the 98th Clause; the first portion refers to the exceptions that are made. If I read it all perhaps you will follow it better: "The exercise in a private house or private room by the family dwelling therein, or by any of them, of manual labour, for the purpose of gain, in or incidental to some of the purposes in this Act in that behalf mentioned, shall not of itself constitute such house or room a workshop where the labour is exercised at irregular intervals" (the last portion of the clause we are prepared to accept as a definition), "and does not furnish the whole or principal means of living to such family." We would take our meaning of a workshop from that; it should be where it does "furnish the whole or principal means of living" to those working there.

8258. Whether they are all members of the same family or not?
Yes.

8259. That would be, in your opinion, a satisfactory definition?
That, so far as we have been able to gather, would even satisfy those who work out themselves; they do not seem to have any objection to that portion of it being enforced.

8260. And you think that to such a workshop the inspector under the Factory Act should have the same access as he has to a factory?
The same as he has to an ordinary workshop or factory. I do not know that the Act, as far as I have been able to understand it, defines exactly the difference between a factory and a workshop; I have not been able to discover it. I may mention that the factory is, so to speak, registered, but you do not call it registered; but the proprietor within one month has to notify to the inspector that he has a factory, and that he is doing a certain kind of work there, and the power he is using, and everything else in connection therewith, and he is subject to a penalty of 5 *l.*

8261. Do you think it would be possible to ascertain whether the work furnished "the whole or principal means of living"?
In our trade it would be very easy.

8262. Practically how would you ascertain it; there would, I imagine, be an advantage to a family in evading the law if there were women and children, because the women would be able to work longer hours; at least they might think it an advantage, and, therefore, they would naturally pretend that the work carried on did not furnish the whole or principal means of living?
We should have no difficulty in our trade. I do not know what difficulty might

might exist outside of ours, but in ours we should have no difficulty whatever, from the fact that it is so easy to get to know that it does furnish the whole or principal means of living" to the family. Our idea at first was that the onus of registration should be thrown upon the employer, he knowing best where the goods are made, and that would prevent a very great deal of difficulty in connection with the discovery of these places. He always knows where the people reside; he is obliged to know.

8263. Not the landlord?

No, the employer; that was our first idea as being the readiest means of arriving at it.

8264. Earl of *Onslow.*] You say that was your "first idea"; have you modified it?

No, I do not know that we have; I do not know but what it is the best yet.

8265. *Chairman.*] Do you think in the case supposed, an inspector would be able to find out whether the people working in the room were members of the same family, and that he could ascertain whether the work they were doing was their only means of support, or their principal means of support?

If the onus of registration fell upon the employer, he would most certainly be able to do so without any difficulty. We labour under so many difficulties with regard to the absence of inspection that I ought to make mention of what takes place in the provinces, but it pertains more or less to wherever our trade is carried on, even in the West-end of London; and no doubt where there are men who work at what we call the order trade, it is still in existence there; it is made use of by employers who desire to enrich themselves very swiftly, as most employers do, as an excuse for sending work out in the first place.

8266. What is used by the employers?

In the absence of inspection it is made use of; the middleman I mean, is made use of specially. For instance, an employer who has a design, and has a strong desire to cheapen his labour, very often will bring work up say between six and seven o'clock at night, and will call on a couple of men (they work in pairs) and say, "I want this got forward by the time I come in the morning, at nine o'clock." One of the men demurs. "Oh no; it is not possible;" perhaps it will require very nearly 12 hours' work before that garment is put out in the state it requires to be. "If you do not feel inclined to do it we can send it out to the middleman; he will do it." You see if the inspection was generally carried out effectively, at all events it would prevent working for these long and irregular hours on the part of any men who work for him. It has another very bad effect, that is, with reference to the sanitary condition of workshops. They are not all good ones, not even those that are on the employer's premises; it has a very bad effect in this special direction; we have frequently reported to us cases of very bad workshops; the men have complained.

8267. You are now speaking of sanitary inspection?

Yes, the men have complained of the sanitary condition and talked rather loud of it; perhaps it has got round to the foreman, and probably the employer hears of it, and he has given them a very general intimation, "If you bring the inspector here I will close this workshop, and send it all out." So the men have been compelled to accept what they conceive to be the lesser evil of the two, and the evil remains. That is continually done. As regards an instrument for cheapening labour (I do not know whether your Lordships have much to do with that), it is one of the most powerful that they make use of. I am now speaking with special reference even to the order trade, because we have unscrupulous masters in it as well as in other departments. That is one common way they do. As a rule tailors are piece-workers nearly throughout the United Kingdom; that is, they get so much according to the time log for making the various garments. Of course if there is plenty of work they make a fair amount of money; in the absence of work they wait for the trade and make very little. The employer has this method of doing the thing.

thing. He knows what the price of a garment will be according to what we call our time-log; but he will put a ticket on the garment and send it up to the workshop with the ticket on it, marked in all probability 2 *s.* or 3 *s.* less than what he knows is the log price. Of course the men have a consultation, and they know what it means. Very often they refuse, generally they refuse, especially in a town where it is fairly organised, and they can get the protection of our society, they refuse. "Oh, well," it just follows the same course, "I know where I can get it done; I will send it out to this middleman;" and it is done frequently. As has been already spoken about, as a trade we do our best, we think we do our share to protect the public, and I think the public should do a little both to protect us and protect themselves. I see it stated that there is one of your Lordships not present here, who is going to introduce a Bill relating to the butchers now selling the American and Australian meat mixed up with the English, to prevent the public being defrauded. I am quite as certain that steps should be taken to prevent these fraudulent trade-marks upon our garments that we make, and that you have a greater interest at stake; because I do not know that the American or Australian beef either would do any amount of harm to the public, but we are quite clear that the garments made up without the supervision of the employers, away from their premises, may possibly carry death and disease with them. So that it is really a question for the public, and we think ourselves, though it might be called a stretch of the imagination, if they were compelled to ticket them "sweater-made coat, trousers, vest," it would only place the public in a fair position.

8268. Earl of *Derby.*] Do you mean that the person who employed the employer should be made to put his name upon the article produced?

I mean to say that the employer, in common honesty to the public, should be compelled to ticket the garments in the special way as he gets them made: that would be "sweater-made coat, trousers, vest;" so that the public would not be deceived. I do not know that there is an industry more trespassed upon than we are with special reference to fraudulent trade-marks. As has already been intimated that is regularly done. It is only two months ago that the mayor of one of our large provincial towns was shown a workshop in that town and he was led to believe that the work was done in that workshop, the whole of it. The man discovered afterwards that there was only half of it done there; the other half was sent out. And that is the case more or less throughout the trade, and we think that we should get a more perfect inspection so that we may be placed fairly in a position to compete with these difficulties which surround us; but with some portion of the Act being permissive in its character and portions of it not enforced, and this 69th Clause being a direct protection to the sweater instead of to the working man, we are placed in a very bad position. I am now speaking of those that I represent as a legitimate portion of the trade, as we call it, the order trade, being placed in a very bad position. Perhaps the competition even in the provinces is more keen than it is in London with special reference to that class of men.

8269. *Chairman.*] Do you mean that in your opinion the evils alleged to exist in the East-end of London are equally felt in the provinces?

Quite so; and with special reference to our portion of the trade that I represent. They are brought more keenly into competition with us in consequence of the Factory and Workshop Act not being enforced, and this special clause that I have mentioned standing in the way. I do not know whether it is possible that one of the great evils could be got rid of if we could only prevail upon the Legislature to carry a law of that kind; that is, that where the Factory and Workshop Act is enforced it should be enforced upon all who work there, whether men, women, young persons, or children. Of course that would mean this, that if an employer conducted the whole of his work by male adults, he is outside of the law now, that is outside the operation of the Factory and Workshop Act, and he would still remain. It is only last October that we had a case which occurred in Birmingham. Of course this is a case which came directly under

under the observation of the factory inspector. He had watched one of these sweaters' establishments, and he knew for certain (it was nearly ten o'clock) that the women had not left, and after waiting for a time he walked up into the workshop, but he found nothing but men there. The door which led from the workshop into another room of course the man walked boldly through, and there he found four women huddled up under bedclothes on a bed who had just left the room where they had been working after hours. Of course I am aware that there is a difficulty surrounding this portion of the question, but still it would really prevent that evasion of the Act as it stands at present that many unscrupulous people take advantage of.

8270. You think, as I understand, that the Factory Act should not be extended to adult male labour, when adult male labour only is employed?
Oh, no.

8271. But that it should affect adult male labour where women are employed in the same place?
Exactly so.

8272. Earl of *Derby*.] You would apply the 10½-hours rule to all workshops where women are employed?
Yes.

8273. Would not that rather discourage the employment of women; would it not put some difficulty in the way of their being employed?
I think not; I think the limitation would naturally increase, perhaps, the value of their labour.

8274. *Chairman*.] Have you anything further to say?
No; with the exception that your attention has been drawn to another great evil by Mr. Zeitlin, or by Mr. Madden, which we know to exist; and that is, the system of the employers permitting (we will say permitting) work to be taken away from the premises after they have worked a regular day. I think that should be construed into a continuation of the work upon the premises. If not it certainly would be holding out a premium for a man to take advantage of the Act, as it appears to us.

8275. Earl of *Onslow*.] You are now speaking of women?
Yes, women or young children. Male adults are outside the pale of the Act as it is at present. There is, perhaps, only one other subject of importance that I need mention, if I am permitted to mention it. I think great efforts will be made to induce your Lordships to extend this condition to the West-end and the provinces. There certainly is as much need of it as there ever was in the East-end of London. Most of the trade that is dealt with in the East-end of London is peculiar in its nature; it is the export trade and the large quantity sale trade; but in the provinces you are brought more face to face with the regular trade; and you have to compete with a lot of men who are always prepared to take great advantage of any position they can occupy; there are always a lot of men prepared to live upon other people, if it is possible, and they do it very nicely.

8276. Earl of *Onslow*.] Is there anything materially different in the conditions in the provinces and in London?
Where that kind of labour has prominence I do not believe that there is any difference in the provinces.

8277. *Chairman*.] Should I be correct in saying that, in your opinion, it is difficult to distinguish the East-end from other portions of the metropolis; that the work may go from one to the other?
Except that special kind of labour, the export and large sale trade.

8278. And although there is nothing, in your opinion, like a migration of labour from the metropolis to the provinces, you would say that labour comes and goes?
Yes.

 8279. And

8279. And that it is difficult therefore to distinguish the metropolis and other large towns?
Yes.

8280. You think the evils are as bad in the provinces as in London?
Yes.

8281. I think you spoke just now of work being permitted to be taken off the premises to be done at home?
Yes.

8282. Do you mean that while ostensibly permitted, they are often compelled to take it?
By the sanction and pressure of the employer.

8283. Is it the case, do you suppose, that these employers would order the people to take work home in order, as one of the witnesses said, to practically evade the Factory Act; I am speaking of women?
I think both things might be done; but I think generally it is to increase their small earnings; as a rule I believe it has more to do with that than anything else; their wages would be so small in many cases were they confined exactly to the hours; I think it is done more to supplement them; and they permit it for that purpose; the evasion of the Act might even form part of it.

8284. You told us that you thought the sweater-made coats and clothes ought to be labelled "sweater-made coats and clothes"?
I think so, in the interests of the public.

8285. But would it not be necessary to define what is meant by a sweater; have you got any definition?
Our common definition of it is a very simple one; it is a man who receives work from an employer; a large quantity of it, far more than he can accomplish himself, for the purpose of employing others under him to make a profit out of their labour.

8286. Work that is sub-contracted, in fact?
Yes.

8287. You think, in fact, that where the work is not made on the premises, where it is brought in, it should be ticketed to that effect, that these have been produced at So-and-So's place?
If they are produced under these conditions, I think it is only fair to the public that they should be so ticketed.

8288. You think that the danger arising from the fact that they are made up under unsanitary conditions is so great that the public are injured?
We have it on the best authority of our medical men; such is the case; they say nothing in the world is so capable of carrying disease as woollen garments, or retaining it so long.

8289. Is the work, generally speaking, as well made by middlemen?
In some cases it would be as well made.

8290. You do not complain of it in that respect?
Oh, dear, no.

8291. You spoke about your time log; what is that?
It is a time list in which the prices for the various garments that are to be made are particularised, together with any extras required for that special garment; they are also particularised.

8292. How are these prices arrived at?
They are arrived at very often by practical men; sometimes employers and men meeting together and commencing the garment from the skeleton, and tracing it gradually up till it is finished; each being a practical man, will have a fair knowledge of what time the particular parts of the garment would take in completing.

8293. I gather

8293. I gather from you that it is difficult, or impossible, for these time-log prices to be maintained, owing to the competition of the sweater?
That is so.

8294. That the employer will require them to be done so much cheaper than the time log, and if these people will not do it, he will say, "Very well, I will send them out to men who will"?
That is done every week.

8295. We have the suggestion made in evidence before the Committee that, for inspection to be properly carried out, both the inspection under the Factory Act and sanitary inspection, the inspectors should have some technical knowledge of the trade; in your opinion is there anything in that suggestion?
I think, for inspection to be effective, a large increase of sub-inspectors is required. I think that men who have a practical knowledge of the trade would answer the purpose much better, far better than many men who have occupied the position of chief inspector; I do not speak invidiously; and they would be men, I think, who would feel more inclined to discharge those difficult and not very pleasant duties of running round back streets and alleys, and going into garrets after nine at night to discover whether these men were breaking the Factory Act.

8296. Earl of *Onslow.*] You mean tailors?
I mean tailors, or anybody who had a practical knowledge of the conditions. Tailors in those positions would be a great advantage to our trade.

8297. *Chairman.*] I understand from you that you think that what is wanted is a sort of sub-inspection?
Yes.

8298. And that it would be an advantage if those men were drawn from the ranks of the various trades, so that they should have some technical knowledge of the dodges and tricks of the trade?
That is so.

8299. It has been suggested also in evidence that it would be a good thing if the factory inspector were able to report and act in reference to sanitation, and that the sanitary inspector should be able to report and act as regards evasions of the Factory Act; what do you say to that?
It would be a good thing; at the present time it is one of those things where what is everybody's business is no one's. The factory inspector takes it for granted that the sanitary inspector is discharging his part of the duties without receiving any intimation from him, and the sanitary inspector supposes that the factory inspector is discharging the whole of his duties without any intimation from him; and in many cases, a very great many, both are neglected, more especially the sanitary condition. It is one of the most difficult things that we have to contend with; men frequently have to lay an information through anonymous letters and things of that kind before we can get some of our very bad places inspected by the sanitary authorities. That is the fact frequently, and it is very objectionable. Innocent men might sometimes bear the brunt of what somebody else did with regard to these places being reported. As a rule Englishmen do not care about being informers, even where they have very bad cases to deal with.

8300. You spoke just now of some of the clauses of the Act of 1878 being permissive; what did you allude to?
The permissive character is in its operation; I had especial reference to this one, the 98th. The last portion of this 98th clause supposes rather, as I gather from it, that an inspector could go to any house or room, or workshop where the labour furnished "the whole or principal means of living to such family." The beginning of the clause has special reference to exceptions; that is, I should say, if a woman made a dress for a friend once in a month, or if a tailor during his leisure hours worked at home for a few hours now and again, or something of that kind, that would be an exception; they would not bring

him under the provisions of the Act; so that, if this was carried out, from the very nature of it, it looks to me so permissive that it never is carried out.

8301. I understand, then, that the only addition that you suggest to be made to the existing factory legislation is, that where men and women work together the regulation of hours applying to women should be extended to men?
And the registration of workshops.

8302. The point that I have mentioned would be one; and, secondly, that the workshops should be registered?
Yes.

8303. Would you charge anything for that registration?
It is a question that we have never considered. As I have told you, when this Act was passed, at that time we made some efforts, and our idea was that the onus should be thrown upon the employers as being the simplest and readiest way, and one which would present no difficulties, we thought.

8304. And you think that, especially in this 98th clause, the Act is too permissive?
Yes.

8305. That it requires to be amended so as to avoid that?
Yes, that would come in in the registration, if it defined what was meant by a workshop.

8306. Lord *Thring*.] You would, in fact, omit the 98th clause?
No, not necessarily, because there are some useful purposes to be served; it states what shall not be a workshop; what people shall be exempt from the operations of the Act; what that is which may be done now and again at different times. I want the last portion of that enforced.

8307. You would wish, in regard to that clause, if there is any doubt about it, that it should be cleared up in the direction of enacting that where the work does "furnish the whole or principal means of living in such family" the room where it is carried on shall be a workshop?
Exactly so. I would have it something in this way: a workshop to be registered under this Act shall mean any room, house, or workshop, where a woman or women, young person or persons, child or children, are employed, and where it forms the whole or principal means of living to those who work therein.

8308. Earl of *Onslow*.] Only women and young children, not men?
We should be very glad if we could see our way, wherever the Act is enforced, to enforce it upon men as well.

8309. *Chairman*.] You said just now that you did not wish it enforced on men alone?
No. Of course if it were possible.

8310. Earl of *Onslow*.] Would you not describe as a workshop a place in which men were employed alone?
The Act itself does not describe it so; now they are outside the Act, all male adults.

8311. This is Mr. Redgrave's own explanation of the section; I will ask you whether you agree with it: "This section applies to cases in which one or more members of a family may be employed at home in some occupation subsidiary to the main occupation of the family, and which is only intermittent or occasional"?
That is quite correct.

8312. *Chairman*.] I do not quite understand what you wish to do with regard to Section 61, the portion of it where it says, "Where the occupier of a workshop has served on an inspector notice of his intention to conduct that workshop on the system of not employing children or young persons therein, the workshop shall be deemed for all the purposes of this Act to be conducted on the said system until the occupier changes it, and no change shall be made until the occupier has served on the inspector notice of his intention to change the system, and

and until the change a child or young person employed in the workshop shall be deemed to be employed contrary to the provisions of this Act." I do not quite understand what you wish to do in reference to that?

The enforcement of this clause and the 15th, which we mentioned before, would have this effect: that nearly the whole of our workshops would be subject to inspection, because nearly the whole of them at the present time either employ, perhaps, a woman as a machinist, or have youths under 18 years of age working in them, and as a consequence that would bring them under the inspector. At the present time this is not carried out; either for want of a sufficient number of inspectors, or else from taking it for granted that the whole are male adults there, these places are not inspected at all. I daresay you could go through some of our large towns, and scarcely find one of these workshops in connection with the employer's premises which the factory inspector had ever been in.

8313. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] About the registration; you said the onus ought to be thrown upon the employer?
Yes.

8314. Whom do you mean by the employer; the head of the workshop?
The principal. For instance, the master tailor, as the case might be.

8315. You do not mean, do you, that if I am the manager of a shop, and put out work to half-a-dozen tailors, I am bound to register all those half-dozen tailors?
I think that would be the readiest way.

8316. But if these half-dozen tailors did work for other people as well as for me, the onus of registration would be thrown on everybody they ever worked for?
Quite so.

8317. Therefore you mean that as soon as a manager gave out work to a new sweater or to a new middleman he would be bound to go, before he gave that man work, and see that that man's workshop was registered?
He would forward a notice to the inspector and get it registered.

8318. But he would not know, perhaps, that it was not registered?
No; there would be that difficulty.

8319. You must put the onus upon him that if a man came and asked for work he would be bound to see that that man was registered?
Yes; which would simply mean putting the question to the man in the case you have mentioned.

8320. Would that be sufficient; because the man might say, "Oh, yes," when he was not registered at all?
If he cared to have the work he would not tell a lie, I think.

8321. The danger appears to me to be that either the Act would be entirely evaded, or every employer would be constantly sending in the names of people to be registered, or else having to go to some office to find out whether they were registered?
I do not know any other way of getting over the difficulty besides simply putting the question to the man and depending on the truthfulness of his answer.

8322. And you think that ought to be a good defence to the employer?
Yes, I think so.

8323. If the employer said, "I asked the man whether his place was registered and he said it was, and therefore I took no further steps," you think that should be a good defence for him?
I think that would be a justification and a fair one.

8324. Lord *Monkswell.*] Would not the principal men, if your plan were carried out, insist upon employing people who were not particular about telling the truth

truth as to whether their places were registered or not; would not they be likely to say, "I shall not employ you unless you say you are registered"?
I could hardly answer that question.

8325. You say your society numbers about 15,000 men?
Yes.

8326. How many outside are eligible and do not join?
I have not any means of judging.

8327. One hundred thousand; as many as that, do you suppose?
No.

8328. You say that an employer sometimes threatens to close his shop if a factory inspector is called in; I suppose a man may close his shop without any loss, and send the work to the middleman?
Yes.

8329. Then for a man to have a shop at all is some concession to his workmen; by putting his work out to middlemen he can do away with the necessity of having a sanitary shop at all?
The position which he occupies in catering for the public, I think, should be distinctly understood.

8330. As to sweater-made coats, I saw this morning a tailor who has subcontracting carried on on his own premises; that is, he employs a man who employs others, and the tailor himself gives the man the room and the work, with the right to employ the people he chooses to employ; would you call that sweating or not?
I do not quite follow you.

8331. The tailor himself has a room on his own premises, and says to a man, "Take that room and employ whom you like; you must give me so much work at such a price; I do not care whom you employ; you may discharge or take on as many men as you like"?
Certainly that would be sweating.

8332. Even though it is carried on under the principal man's own eyes?
But it leaves the man open to take every advantage he possibly can of those he employs; if the principal does not directly employ them himself he leaves the man at liberty to take all the advantages he thinks proper. I think it is merely saying to the man, "Here you are; take what advantage you can of the people you employ."

8333. Earl of *Onslow*.] In reference to Clause 15 of the Factory and Workshop Act, do you say that as a matter of fact the employers never do serve the notices required by that clause on the inspector.
I have never yet found a single instance where an employer has notified to the inspector that he is conducting the whole of his work by male adults.

8334. Is there any penalty attached to that clause?
No, only this one, that of course if he was found breaking the Factory and Workshop Act he would be subject to the same penalty as anyone else.

8335. But there is no special penalty for failing to comply with that section?
No.

8336. Would you desire to see one?
The registration would get rid of the difficulty, to our mind.

8337. Then with regard to Clause 69, to which you called the Committee's attention, formerly under the old Factory Act the inspector might enter a workshop "when any person is at work at any handicraft;" would that meet your objection to the present Act; formerly if a man was at work in the workshop the factory inspector had a right to go on without an order of a Secretary of State; would that meet your objection?
We would have it more safeguarded than that; our definition is the best we can give; where it furnishes a living to the whole of the people working there.

8338. I asked

8338. I asked you with regard to the entry of the factory inspector?
The factory inspector might enter when a man was merely doing some small amount of work which might take him a short amount of time and with long intervals.

8339. But at the present moment a factory inspector may not enter into a place used both as a dwelling and workshop?
He cannot.

8340. Would it meet your views if the factory inspector were empowered, without an order of the Secretary of State, to enter any place "when any person is at work at any handicraft;" that is the old law; I want to know whether reverting to the old law would meet your views?
I do not want to inflict any hardship. If a man was merely doing a few hours' work, and merely once in a fortnight or a week, would that constitute the power?

8341. Undoubtedly?
Then we should object to it.

8342. I understand you object to the definition of "workshop" as defined by the Act; I will just read it to you; it is Clause 93, Sub-section (2): "The expression 'workshop' in this Act means any premises, room, or place not being a factory within the meaning of this Act, in which premises, room, or place, or within the close or curtilage or precincts of which premises any manual labour is exercised by way of trade, or for purposes of gain in, or incidental to, the following purposes." Then it goes on to speak of "the making of articles," and so forth; is not that a sufficient definition of a workshop?
When I drew your Lordships' attention to this, I said that I did not exactly understand how the Act defined the difference between a factory and a workshop.

8343. Does not that clause sufficiently define it?
That portion of it does. I thought the question had special reference to the difference between a factory and a workshop.

8344. I asked you whether this definition to your mind covered all the workshops it would be necessary to cover?
Yes.

8345. Now, what your recommendation comes to is, the registration of the workshops into which an employer sends his sub-contracts; what is the main object of that; is it to enable the factory inspector to visit the workshop, or that the people who are employed should know that their workshop is registered?
To prevent unfair competition as between those who might work in and out: and also that the sanitary arrangements might be better carried out than they are, that men inside might be placed on a better footing.

8346. You would require that the employer should be himself satisfied with the place to which he is going to send his work, and that he should not rely upon the statements made by his *employés*?
Yes.

8347. If any misdescription were given by the *employés*, you would make the contractor responsible for it?
If the place was registered, I should think the inspector would take care that the place was in fairly good order if there were a sufficient number of inspectors.

8348. But if the work were going to be sent out, you would wish that the contractor should have a register of all the places to which he sends that work?
Yes.

8349. And that he should compile that register from personal observation, and not from the description given to him by the *employés*?
That is to say, you mean that he should make a personal inspection of the premises where the work is being sent to; I think that would be very useful and very necessary.

8350. You complained of the absence of sufficient inspection; do you think that that is due to a want of knowledge of the places to be inspected, or to the insufficient number of the inspectors?
To the insufficient numbers.

8351. Then you think that the factory inspector knows where all the workshops are, and does not visit them, because he has not time?
I do not think he has the opportunity to find out all the workshops where they are.

8352. Then your answer to both my questions is in the affirmative?
Yes.

8353. Then you would not only increase the number of inspectors, but also increase the facilities for knowing where the workshops are?
Exactly so.

8354. As to the respective duties of the sanitary inspectors and the factory inspectors, do you think that the sanitary inspectors are aware of what their duty is with regard to the duty of the factory inspectors?
I have tried to get an understanding with reference to the two bodies. It appears to be not the special duty of either one or the other of them to report cases backwards and forwards.

8355. But is not the special duty of the sanitary inspector to inspect all premises where there are supposed to be insanitary conditions?
But the difficulty is getting the sanitary inspector there; we find we cannot do it without laying an information.

8356. Then you say he neglects his duty?
It must be a neglect of duty; we cannot get them (and that is quite certain) without laying an information, and very often after it is laid we do not get them then.

8357. May it in any degree arise from this that the sanitary inspector thinks it is the factory inspector's business, and the factory inspector thinks it is the sanitary inspector's business?
That is so. Is it not the fact that the sanitary inspector is perhaps appointed by the local authorities who pay him his salary and have very great control over him, more than they should have. It is a question of the tradesmen portion of the population.

8358. The leading local authorities usually consist of the owners of property in the district?
Frequently.

8359. And therefore they would have an interest to some extent in keeping dark any little defects that there might be in the sanitary surroundings?
Certainly. Without giving the name of the town or the parties, I may say that it is only within this last month that in consequence of articles in the "Lancet," in one of our very large towns the health committee the other day had their attention drawn to it, and one of the strong opponents to anything being done, and who was trying to make it appear that things were right as they are, was a man who really owned more than half the street where the worst description of our trade is done in that town.

8360. You have no such objection to offer with regard to the factory inspector?
No.

8361. Being

8361. Being appointed by the State, by the Government he is a more independent man?
More independent than the other, by far.

8362. Therefore you would rather entrust to him these sanitary duties than to the person appointed by the local authority?
Than the present officers I would.

8363. With regard to what you think a fraudulent trade-mark, do you say that there is anything now to lead the public to believe that any particular article is made on the premises of the vendor?
It is very often advertised that the whole of the garments are made under their own supervision, or on their own premises.

8364. In cases where such advertisement takes place, or where the public are led to believe that the articles are made on the premises, you would say that there should be a penalty attached to selling any articles and describing them as made on the premises when they were not made on the premises?
Decidedly.

8365. You would not say that each maker should have his name put on the inside of the garments made by him?
No.

8366. With regard to the question of inspection, I understood you to say that you thought tailors' shops ought to be inspected by tailors?
I said that it would be a greater advantage to our trade than anything else if that were done.

8367. Why, in your opinion, should a tailor be a better judge of sanitary surroundings than a doctor?
I was speaking of him then simply as a factory inspector; he knows more of the habits of the trade and where to find the places and the conditions under which they work. I would not say that a tailor is desirable as a sanitary inspector.

8368. Do you mean that he knows more of the hours that people should be employed and the conditions under which they should be employed than a doctor does?
He knows more how they do work and are employed at the present time.

8369. Would not the duty of the factory inspector be to carry out the Act of Parliament?
It would.

8370. Being armed with that Act of Parliament, would he not know exactly what his duties were?
He would not know the neighbourhood and the conditions under which the men worked, as well as a man who had been reared in the trade. For instance, as an illustration, I dare say you could find a man who would take you through the most thronged neighbourhoods in London, so far as our out-door work or the sweating in our trade is concerned, who would take you through them in a short time from his practical knowledge of the habits and conditions under which the people work; whereas a man, however active he might be, who had to make all these discoveries, and make himself acquainted with the facts, would take a very long time to do it.

8371. What you say comes to this, does it not, that you recommend the appointment of persons acquainted with the locality?
And with the conditions under which the people work.

8372. In that particular locality?
Yes.

8373. But you would not recommend having a tailor from Birmingham, who had never been in London, to inspect the tailors in London?
No; because he would have a great deal to learn first.

8374. What you wish is that the factory inspectors should be acquainted with the locality, and the manner in which the trade is carried on in London?
Yes.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Jovis, 12° *Julii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of ONSLOW.
Lord CLINTON.
Lord CLIFFORD OF CHUDLEIGH.
Lord FOXFORD (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord MONKSWELL.
Lord THRING.

LORD KENRY (EARL OF DUNRAVEN AND MOUNT-EARL), IN THE CHAIR.

MR. FRANCIS TERRELL, is called in, and having been sworn; is Examined, as follows:

8375. *Chairman.*] You are a member of the firm of Terrell and Atkinson?
I am.

8376. You are solicitors to Mr. Arnold White?
As to the cabinet trade.

8377. And you assisted Mr. Arnold White in the evidence which he gave before the Committee, and which he brought before the Committee?
We did.

8378. Was it done through you or through Mr. Atkinson?
Through both of us.

8379. Can you speak as to the whole facts of the case?
I think my partner could speak even better than I could; he took a great deal of the evidence, more than I did, I think; at least, that is rather difficult to say. He keeps the books of my firm.

8380. Do you think Mr. Atkinson can speak more authoritatively on the point?
I think he can, as to items of expenditure.

8381. Is Mr. Atkinson here?
He is.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. PERCY HERBERT ATKINSON, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

8382. *Chairman.*] It has been suggested before the Committee that some of the evidence which witnesses who have been before the Committee were prepared to state was altered or cut out by you, or by your firm, and also that sums of money were paid to witnesses by your firm acting for Mr. Arnold White. I wish to ask you two or three questions on those points. You assisted Mr. Arnold White in preparing the evidence that he gave before this Committee?
Yes, I got it up for him.

8383. And also the evidence of some of the witnesses?
Yes, nearly the whole of them, as to the cabinet trade. My firm had nothing to do excepting with the cabinet trade.

8384. Can you give us the names of the witnesses whose evidence you got up?
Van Damme, Deintje, Jackson, Adams, Smith, Brown, Dickson, Shaughnessy, Frood (all of these were not called; their statements were taken, and they were here), Walker, Holland, Clarke, Warn, Richards, and Sadler.

8385. Earl of *Onslow.*] Did you take the depositions of Ham, of Miller, of Baum, or of Waltham?
No.

8386. *Chairman.*] Did you employ Miller to assist you?
Yes, I engaged Miller, at a salary of 2 *l.* a week to go round, and get up evidence and bring the witnesses to me; and he did so, and I took their statements down. In no case were they altered in any respect; they were their voluntary statements. Those that were written out in long-hand from the witnesses' dictation were signed by them; but in some cases they were taken down in shorthand, and copies were sent to the witnesses afterwards.

8387. I understand you that you gave Mr. Miller 2 *l.* a week to find witnesses for you?
Yes.

8388. Did the witnesses then come to your office?
In most cases they came to my office.

8389. And what they wished to say was taken down by a shorthand writer?
Either by a shorthand writer or in long-hand.

8390. They then signed the statements which they had made?
Yes.

8391. And you say that you in no respect altered them?
No; in no sense altered them, or suppressed any name that they mentioned.

8392. You did not withdraw anything from it?
No; I give a total denial to Maple's evidence on that point.

8393. Nor added anything to them?
Nor added anything to them.

8394. Did you pay these various witnesses?
I paid some of them. The only sums I paid, in addition to Miller, amounted to 4 *l.*, and they were paid to seven witnesses. The highest amount was 20 *s.*, and the lowest 2 *s.* 6 *d.*

8395. A day, do you mean?
No, for coming to my office to have their statements taken down and attending here; in most cases two days.

8396. You paid seven witnesses 4 *l.*, the highest being one sovereign and the lowest 2 *s.* 6 *d.*?
Yes.

8397. That was to recompense them for their loss of time in attending the Committee two days?
And at my office having their statements taken down.

8398. How did you decide upon the amount to give each individual?
I ascertained what time they had lost, and about what their wages were, and I paid them not more than they said they were earning.

8399. You based it upon what their earnings were?
I based it upon what their average earnings were.

8400. And beyond that you were not aware of any money being given to them?

No;

No; all the payments for witnesses on behalf of Mr. Arnold White went through my firm, and these are the only payments made. The statement that 2*s.* 6*d.* an hour was paid is totally untrue; nobody ever received any such sum.

8401. Are you aware that Committees remunerate witnesses who attend before them for the value of the time that they lose?
No, I was not aware of that.

8402. Mr. Arnold White never told you so?
No, he did not.

8403. Have you any knowledge of the methods which Miller employed in obtaining the evidence he brought to you?
No; he went about, as I understood, in the trade, and spoke to the men about it, and if they could give any evidence that he thought was of use he brought them to my office.

8404. It would not be correct then to say that you were instructed by Mr. Arnold White to obtain, or that you instructed Miller to obtain for you, only evidence on the cabinet-making trade affecting the firm of Maple and Company?
No, certainly not; and my firm wrote a letter to the papers soon after we were instructed, inviting communications from witnesses, and no reference whatever was made to Messrs. Maple; we gave no special instructions to Miller as regards Messrs. Maple.

8405. What date is that letter?
It is a letter which was in the "Daily Chronicle" of May the 8th (*handing it to the Chairman*).

8406. That is the same letter that has been alluded to before the Committee. Perhaps you will read it to us again?
(*The Witness reads the letter set out at No.* 5938, *on page* 604.)

8407. Earl of *Onslow.*] That appeared in other papers besides the "Daily Chronicle"?
Yes, it was sent to the daily papers.

8408. All the daily papers?
Most of them.

8409. *Chairman.*] Do you know anything of a man of the name of Franz Feuerstahler?
I do not know him, but my firm took his statement; I did not.

8410. He did not come to give evidence?
My partner saw him; I did not.

8411. You are not aware whether he came before the Committee to give evidence or not?
I do not know anything about him.

8412. Have you had many, or any, men brought before you whose evidence you rejected?
Not more than three or four.

8413. Why did you reject them?
Because their evidence really did not apply to sweating at all. There was one witness who wanted to give evidence against Messrs. Maple, but I did not think it affected the question at all, and so I told him it was no use.

8414. Do you mean you thought it was merely a personal matter not affecting the sweating system?
It was to the effect that he had offered to Mr. Maple some furniture at a price, and Mr. Maple had offered him a much less price; but it had nothing to do, in my opinion, with the sweating system, and so I did not take the statement.

8415. Were you present, or was any member of your firm present, while the witnesses were examined before the Committee?
My partner was.

8416. Lord *Thring.*] Did you know what evidence Mr. Miller was going to give before the Committee?
No; I was not here when the evidence was given.

8417. He did not state to you what he was going to say before he came here?
No; I never saw Mr. Miller until after he had given his evidence here.

8418. Your partner saw him?
No, not until after.

8419. And what induced you to employ Mr. Miller in particular?
Because he knew all the trade very well.

8420. Earl of *Onslow.*] When did you commence collecting evidence for Mr. White?
I think it was the beginning of May.

8421. Did you see Mr. Miller yourself?
I did not see him until after he had given his evidence.

8422. Who instructed Mr. Miller to collect the evidence?
I did. After Miller had given his evidence, Mr. White sent him down to our office, and I engaged him to collect evidence on this sweating.

8423. Did yon tell him when he was collecting the evidence that Mr. Arnold White was going to stand at the next election for Dulwich against Mr. Maple?
No, I did not know it.

8424. Did you engage Mr. Parnell?
No; Mr. Parnell assisted in getting up the evidence.

8425. Was he paid for so doing?
No, nothing.

8426. When did he begin to collect the evidence for you?
About the same time.

8427. Then did you write letters to different parties that you thought were likely to be able to give valuable evidence?
If any name was mentioned to us of a person who could probably give evidence, we did write in a good many instances to ask them if they could, and if so, for an appointment.

8428. Have you copies of those letters?
I have in the office; in the letter-book.

8429. And what did you ask the men usually to come and give evidence about; in what respect?
I said, "We understand you can give evidence with regard to the sweating system in the cabinet trade; if so, will you let us have an appointment; either call upon us here, or we will call upon you."

8430. Did you say, with respect to Messrs. Maple's conduct towards their men?
No; there was no special reference to Messrs. Maple.

8431. You merely asked for general evidence on the cabinet trade?
Yes.

8432. And you omitted the name of Messrs. Maple from all your letters?
Yes.

8433. And you can put in copies of them?
Yes.

8434. Did

8434. Did you take the statement of Mr. Deintje?
It was taken down in my presence by my shorthand clerk.

8435. And then?
And then it was read over to him, and he approved it, said it was correct, and subsequently a copy of it was forwarded to him.

8436. Have you got the statement that was taken down in shorthand?
Yes.

8437. And the copy that was sent to him?
No, I have not got that; he has got that.

8438. We should like to have, I think, a copy of the statement that was taken?
(*The Witness hands in a paper to his Lordship.*)

8439. This is taken from your shorthand clerk's notes.
That is the original transcript from the shorthand notes.

8440. Verbatim?
Verbatim.

8441. And was that copied and sent to Mr. Deintje?
Yes; a correct copy of it was sent to Mr. Deintje before he gave his evidence here.

8442. What do you mean by "correct?"
A true copy.

8443. A complete copy, you mean?
Yes.

8444. Not an altered copy?
No, not in any sense.

8445. Have you been collecting evidence for Mr. Arnold White through the whole of this inquiry, apart from the cabinet trade?
No, only with reference to the cabinet trade.

8446. Then your instructions only commenced after Mr. Arnold White had given his evidence-in-chief with regard to the sweating in the cabinet trade?
Yes.

8447. Then if Mr. Deintje states that when his evidence was returned to him, all names of firms who practised sweating in the cabinet trade, except that of Messrs. Maple, were expunged, it would not be true.
No, quite untrue.

8448. And you were not instructed by Mr. White to strike out the names of any other firms except that of Messrs. Maple?
No; my instructions were purely general, with no specific reference to Maple or anyone else.

8449. Then with regard to Mr. Parnell's evidence, you prepared that, I think you said, did you not?
He assisted us in getting up evidence, but he prepared his own statement.

8450. You did not prepare anything for him?
No.

8451. Did you see Mr. Clarke who gave evidence, one of Mr. Arnold White's witnesses?
Mr. Terrell saw him. You mean, I suppose, of Gillow and Company?

8452. Yes?
Yes.

8453. Are there any of these witnesses besides Mr. Parnell that you did not give assistance to, whose statements you did not prepare?
Waltham; he prepared his own statement.

8454. But I think you say you prepared Mr. Richards' statement?
No; Richards prepared his own statement; we copied it for him.

8455. In your answer to the Chairman, I understood you to say that Mr. Richards was one of them?
The names I gave were the names of the witnesses whom I had seen, and in most cases I took their statements; but Richards' was a very long statement; he required a considerable time to prepare it, and he brought it to me already drafted, and I simply copied it; had it copied in the office.

8456. You can say what the total sum that you paid was, cannot you; have you an account of it there?
Yes.

8457. Did you only pay by time; the time that the witnesses took?
Yes.

8458. You did not give them any other remuneration?
None whatever.

8459. There was no treating?
No, we did not treat anybody.

8460. And you did not authorise Miller to spend money in that way?
No; we paid Miller 2*l.* a week for five weeks, making 10*l.* in all, and nothing else, either for expenses or any other thing.

8461. You advanced no money to him for any such purpose?
No.

8462. Lord *Clinton.*] When you selected Mr. Miller to give evidence you knew that he had been employed by Messrs. Maple?
Yes; I had read the evidence he had given myself.

8463. You knew that he had certain grievances against Mr. Maple?
Yes.

8464. And that in his evidence he had made certain charges against Mr. Maple?
Yes.

8465. And you say that that did not influence you at all in your selection of him?
Not at all.

8466. What witnesses did Miller bring of those that you have given the Committee the names of?
He brought Jackson, Adams, Smith; I think he brought Frood; I am not quite certain; and Richards; I think that is all of those whose statements we took; he brought a good many more whose statements we did not take, because after a few minutes' conversation with them, we found out that their statement had no bearing on the inquiry.

8467. And they were not examined here?
No; we did not take their statements.

8468. Did you give Miller any written instructions?
No.

8469. All verbal?
Verbal. He used to come to the office nearly every day reporting what he had done, and received further instructions.

8470. Earl of *Limerick.*] Did you hear, or have you seen, the evidence that was given here on the 9th of July?
Which evidence?

8471. I was

8471. I was going to refer to Mr. John Wicks' evidence?
No, I have not seen it.

8472. Was your partner here then?
I think he might have been; I am not sure.

8473. And you cannot say anything on the subject of Wicks' evidence?
No, I have not seen anything about it.

8474. On page 744, at Question 7684, he states that he was offered by Miller half a guinea a day to give evidence here. It begins at Question 7682, "Have you had any communication with Mr. Miller in reference to this inquiry?—(*A.*) He came round to my place when I was working at Wainwright's, in Hoxton, and asked me to come with him and give evidence. I could not get away then. (*Q.*) Did he wish you to give the same evidence as he did?—(A.) Most likely he did, because he said my pay would be half-a-guinea a-day. I said, well, I could not help it, I could not get away; I could not leave the business. (*Q.*) He offered you half-a-guinea a-day to give evidence here?—(*A.*) Yes. (*Q.*) When was that?—(*A.*) It might be a month back; I cannot tell exactly. (*Q.*) It was not before May?—(*A.*) I suppose it must have been the latter part of May." Do you know anything as to that?
That is the first I have heard of it.

8475. You are not able to speak from your own knowledge of anything on that subject?
No; the only instructions we gave to Miller were that any witnesses who came forward would be paid for their loss of time; and those we did pay we paid upon the average of their earnings.

8476. You said, as I understood, that neither you nor your partner saw Miller until he had given evidence here?
I did not, and I think my partner did not.

8477. Are you aware how it was that he came to give evidence before this Committee?
No; Mr. Arnold White was in communication with him.

8478. Mr. Arnold White was in communication with Miller?
Yes.

8479. And you do not know what instructions he gave to Miller as to collecting evidence?
He gave none. After Mr. Arnold White and Miller had given their evidence, Mr. Arnold White sent Miller down to us, and we instructed him to get up evidence, and engaged him at 2 *l.* a week.

8480. But Mr. Arnold White had previously been in communication with Mr. Miller?
Yes.

8481. Do you know whether Mr. Arnold White may have, before you were in communication with him, authorised him to collect evidence?
I should think not, because we arranged with Mr. Arnold White that we should employ him from that time.

8482. Who suggested to you to employ Miller?
Mr. Arnold White.

8483. And Mr. Arnold White must have had some considerable communication with him previously?
They had been in communication about the evidence Miller was to give.

8484. You did not take the evidence of Miller?
No; we were not instructed at that time.

8485. You cannot in any way say whether Miller had received any previous instructions before those that you gave him, or your partner gave him?
No; but if he had they would have been superseded by my instructions.

 8486. I think

8486. I think some questions were asked by a noble Lord as to Mr. Deintje's statement; you put in his statement?
Yes.

8487. Is that an accurate copy of the shorthand notes?
It is.

8488. Have you got the shorthand notes here?
No, I have not. My clerk read the shorthand notes over to Deintje in my presence, and he subsequently wrote them out, and that is the transcript.

8489. Then, as I understand, you offered no inducement of any sort beyond the sums that are stated there (*pointing to a written statement*) to any witnesses to come before the Committee?
That is so.

8490. Lord *Sandhurst.*] You say that you took steps to find out the amount of wages these men were earning, with a view to compensating them for their loss of time?
Yes.

8491. What steps did you take?
We asked them what they were earning, and they told us, and we found it was near the mark, and we paid them on that basis.

8492. Is it possible that some of them at the time may have been unemployed?
They said they were not; we could not say whether they were.

8493. You said that Mr. Richards made his statement, and that you had it copied for him?
Yes.

8494. Do I understand you to deny emphatically that the sense of that statement was in any way altered?
Entirely; it was copied verbatim, and nothing was suppressed or added to that or any other statement.

8495. You say that is the case as to his statement; and that is the case with all the other statements?
It is.

8496. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] I suppose Miller knew, or had been told by you, that the witnesses who came to give evidence here would be paid a certain amount for loss of time?
Yes, they would be compensated for loss of time.

8497. By you?
By us.

8498. And the general rete of payment was about 2 *s.* 6 *d.*, or 5 *s.* or 6 *s.* a day?
Yes.

8499. Lord *Monkswell.*] In your letter you said: "In the event of evidence being used, involving loss to the person giving it, a guarantee will be given against any such loss." What did you want the witnesses to understand by that?
That if by giving evidence they lost their situation or lost their business, Mr. Arnold White would compensate them.

8500. Has any question arisen of compensating them for such loss?
None.

8501. Earl of *Onslow.*] Have you got the shorthand writer's notes of the statements of Dickson, Van Damme, Brown, Adams, and Shaughnessy?
I have not any shorthand notes here.

8502. Have

8502. Have you got the copies from the shorthand notes?
Yes.

8503. Will you show me them?
(*The Witness hands in certain documents.*)

8504. *Chairman.*] Could you give us the sums that you paid to these various witnesses?
Yes.

8505. Just give us the names of those whom you paid, and what sums you paid them?
Jackson, 15 *s.*; Adams, 15 *s.*; Smith, 15 *s.*; A. Smith, 10 *s.*; Carrick, 2 *s.* 6 *d.*; Frood, 2 *s.* 6 *d.*; Warn, 20 *s.*; Fuller, one week, 2 *l.*; Miller, five weeks, 10 *l.*

8506. I understand that all these witnesses attended at your office one day, at any rate?
Yes.

8507. Can you tell the Committee how often they attended before the Committee?
Two days each; in some cases more; but that was the least.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. FRANCIS TERRELL, having been re-called, is further Examined, as follows:

8508. *Chairman.*] I understand that you attended the Committee when this evidence on the cabinet trade was given?
I was here generally.

8509. And you heard the evidence of these witnesses, whose statements were taken down in your office?
Yes, in most cases.

8510. Speaking generally, did the evidence they gave before the Committee coincide with the statements they had given to you?
They seemed a little stronger when they spoke it than when they had it written out; that was the only difference, I think.

8511. Mr. Arnold White objected, I think, to the evidence given by Deintje, as not coinciding with the statement?
He did.

8512. Is that a correct allegation?
It was at our request; we asked him not to call him.

8513. I understand you recommended Mr. Arnold White not to call the witness Deintje, because you did not consider him a reliable witness?
You will see that stated in the evidence that we put in there; if you refer to the notes you will see that we put in brackets "This witness is not reliable."

8514. Did the evidence that he gave coincide with the statement that he had made to you?
Exactly the reverse, I think.

8515. Earl of *Onslow.*] You saw Mr. Feuerstahler?
I did.

8516. And Mr. Arnold White did not call him as a witness?
He came here, and I think the Chairman proposed to call him; but owing to his connection with Deintje we did not call him; I forget now, there were so many witnesses; but I think it was so.

8517. How did you come to know Feuerstahler; through Miller?
I believe so.

8518. Did you see Feuerstahler yourself?
I did.

8519. And did you tell him that one of the objects Mr. Arnold White had in view was because he wished to oppose Mr. Maple at the next election?
I did not.

8520. If anybody said that it was not true?
It is perfectly untrue.

8521. Did you see Mr. Clarke, who gave evidence before the Committee; do you remember him a partner in Gillows?
I did.

8522. Was it in consequence of the evidence that Mr. Parnell gave against Messrs. Gillow's firm that you saw him?
No, I do not think it was. We called on him.

8523. He did not give any evidence about the Sweating System; he came to correct Mr. Parnell's evidence principally. Was not that so?
He came to make a statement that the best men in his trade were accustomed only to put their names on furniture which they themselves had made; I think that is all he proposed to do.

8524. And Mr. Parnell was re-called at Mr. White's request, and under your instructions, I presume?
I cannot say that it was under our instructions.

8525. Were you cognisant of it?
I really do not remember the fact.

8526. You do not remember that Mr. Parnell was re-called to say that he had made a mistake if he indicated Messrs. Gillows in the charges he made; you do not recollect that evidence?
I do not happen to recollect that.

8527. You did not make an arrangement with Mr. Clarke and Mr. Parnell that all reference to any firm except Messrs. Maple's should be struck out of the evidence to be given?
I did not.

8528. Did you see Mr. Parnell's statement; did you supply it to him?
No; he made it himself, I believe.

8529. And you made no arrangement with him that he should omit the mention of other firms than Messrs. Maple's?
None. We did not prepare it for him; at least I did not; and I think my partner did not.

8530. Lord *Clinton*.] Had you anything to do with the collection of evidence by Miller?
Nothing, in the sense that he collected it, and we did not.

8531. But he was instructed to collect it?
He was.

8532. Had you anything to do with that; it was by your firm?
We took the evidence that he brought, whoever happened to be in.

8533. Did you see him after, before or after, he gave his evidence before this Committee?
Probably both; I do not remember; I cannot fix the date.

8534. I mean had you any conversation with him about getting evidence to bring before the Committee?
We constantly had conversation with him.

8535. About

8535. About collecting evidence?
When he brought evidence, we discussed what he was proposing to do; what he was doing, that is all.

8536. And can you remember the witnesses that he brought?
No, I cannot; my partner has got them; he has given them.

8537. Earl of *Limerick.*] Mr. Atkinson said that he had not seen Miller before he gave evidence here?
No, he had not.

8538. Had you seen him before?
I believe not; I am uncertain of the date, I should say.

8539. Who originally asked Miller to give evidence?
I do not know.

8540. Who brought him to you?
I believe he was sent to our office by Mr. Arnold White.

8541. And what were your reasons for employing him to collect evidence?
Mr. Arnold White had sent him to us for that purpose, I presume.

8542. And did you know anything about his character previously?
Nothing.

8543. Or whether he would be a reliable person to collect evidence?
No, we did not know.

8544. Are you aware that at an earlier portion of this inquiry, Mr. Arnold White pledged himself personally to the care with which the evidence had been collected?
I am not aware of it.

8545. As a matter of fact, you knew nothing about Miller before he was sent to you to collect evidence?
We had never heard of him before.

8546. And you suppose that he came to you under Mr. Arnold White's instructions; he would have done so?
He must have done so, I think.

8547. And with instructions that he was to be employed in collecting evidence?
I have no doubt that it was so.

8548. You made no inquiry whatever as to Miller's previous character?
Not that I remember.

8549. Are you aware whether any other person, or persons, have been making any payment to witnesses to appear here?
Mr. Arnold White instructed us that all payments were to come through us.

8550. Lord *Sandhurst.*] I understand you to say that the statements that were made here were somewhat stronger than they were when you saw them written down in some cases?
I thought so.

8551. Do you mean that they were altered, or do you mean merely that they appeared more graphic when given verbally than in the written statements?
I think probably both; but I was referring to Brown's evidence at the time.

8552. And you, like your partner, emphatically deny altering the evidence in any sense?
Emphatically.

8553. *Chairman.*] I suppose personally you cannot vouch for these statements being correctly transcribed from the shorthand notes?
No, except that one would discharge a clerk who did not correctly transcribe them.

8554. Did you employ the same shorthand clerk for them all?
We have had the same for the last ten years.

8555. And I suppose he could give evidence on that point?
Yes.

8556. You could not say whether the statement of Mr. Deintje is correctly transcribed from the notes?
I could be prepared to swear to it, because I have reliance in my clerk who has been with us so long.

8557. Earl of *Onslow*]. I understand that you did not begin to collect evidence on this Inquiry till some time after Mr. Arnold White had given his first evidence and brought his first witnesses?
Yes.

8558. Can you explain why it was that Mr. Arnold White employed you to collect evidence with reference to the cabinet-making trade, and not the other trades?
I understood from him that he had more than he could attend to.

8559. He did not employ any other firm of solicitors to collect evidence in the former part of the case?
He had too much to do, I think I understood him.

8560. It was not because you had any special reason for being acquainted with the state of the cabinet trade that he employed you?
No; no reason that I know of.

8561. When you said that the evidence given by the witnesses was rather stronger than the statements made to you, did you refer to the same facts that were given in evidence by Mr. Parnell. He said, in reply to Question 7907, "Some of them" (that is the trade society) "thought I did not make it quite strong enough. (*Q*). Against Messrs. Maple?—(*A*). Against others as well as Messss. Maple." Is that what you had in your mind; had you it in your mind that the evidence which was given before the Committee was stronger in the sense that Mr. Parnell says that dissatisfaction was shown by his society because some of them thought he "did not make it quite strong enough against others as well as Messrs. Maple"?
I had Brown's evidence in my mind, and only Brown's, when I made the statement.

8562. Earl of *Limerick.*] May I ask what was the exact date when you were first instructed by Mr. Arnold White to act for him in this Inquiry?
By referring to my papers I can tell; I can find out. At the present moment I cannot give you the date.

8563. You will hand it in later?
Yes.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. PERCY HERBERT ATKINSON, having been re-called; is further Examined, as follows:

8564. *Chairman.*] I THINK you said that you could testify as to the accuracy of the statement purporting to be the statement that Mr. Deintje made to you or your firm?
Yes; that after it was taken down in shorthand my clerk read it out from his shorthand

shorthand notes to Deintje in my presence, and Deintje said it was correct, and he went away; my clerk transcribed it within the next half hour, and it is the same to the best of my recollection.

8565. This document is not signed?
No; that was written out after Deintje had left, he could not wait while it was transcribed from the shorthand notes; but a copy was sent to him some days before he gave evidence here, and he never objected to it or wrote to us on the subject.

8566. With regard to those witnesses whose statements you heard, did you pay all of them?
No, I only paid those whose names I have given; not above half of them altogether.

8567. Why did you not pay the others?
They did not want to be paid.

8568. Can you tell us who the others were?
Yes; Richards was not paid, Van Damme was not paid, nor Brown, Dickson, Shaughnessy, Walker, Clarke; none of those were paid.

8569. Why were they not paid; you say they did not require to be paid?
They did not require to be paid, they gave their evidence voluntarily.

8570. You do not know whether they knew that they would be paid by the Committee?
No; I did not know, until you mentioned it, that they received any payment from the Committee.

8571. Did you select these witnesses who were called, who were brought here, from a large number?
All the statements that we took were handed to Mr. Arnold White; all the witnesses were present here, and some of them were called, and some not.

8572. But those who were present here, were they selected out of a large number who came to you?
Yes.

8573. Why did you select these in particular who were called?
We selected only those that we thought were material.

8574. I see in that advertisement that you put in the paper you said that "such communications will be regarded as confidential"?
Yes. We had a great many communications which were marked "private and confidential," and we did not use them in any way.

8575. Do you mean that the persons giving the information did not wish to be called?
Yes; they gave us information in their letters, but said they did not wish it to be used; so we could not do anything with it.

8576. Why did they object to being called?
I do not know, I am sure.

8577. Earl of *Onslow*.] Do you recollect seeing a letter from Deintje's solicitor to the public papers?
Yes.

8578. You do not happen to have a copy of that with you?
No, I do not.

8579. You do not recollect what he stated?
I remember there was a letter denying that he had been tampered with. I understood Mr. Arnold White alleged that Deintje had been tampered with, and his solicitor wrote denying it.

8580. Do you recollect whether anything else was mentioned in that letter?
I do not recollect anything else.

8581. Lord *Thring.*] You have no reason, I presume, to doubt that your shorthand writer transcribed the statement correctly?

Not the least. I remember the substance of the evidence that was read over in my presence, and I am sure it was a correct transcript; but I could have him here this afternoon with his shorthand notes, if you prefer it.

8582. Lord *Clinton.*] You gave the Committee the names of five witnesses, I think who you said were selected by Miller?

Yes.

8583. The object of that evidence, I understood, was to give evidence generally on the cabinet trade?

Yes.

8584. I can only find at present the names of two of them who were examined before the Committee; Richards and Adams; and I find their evidence almost entirely consists of evidence about Mr. Maple?

The statements were all in Mr. White's hands, and he called the evidence; we had nothing to do with it.

8585. I am speaking of the evidence given before the Committee by those witnesses who were brought by Miller; and I find that the evidence they gave is almost entirely concerned with Messrs. Maple?

There were a good many others whom Miller brought.

8586. But they have not apparently been called?

That I have had nothing to do with.

8587. Can you account for the evidence of these two witnesses who were brought by Miller being concerned only with Messrs. Maple, and not with the cabinet trade generally?

No. I understood that the others would have been called if there had been time.

8588. *Chairman.*] You are aware, perhaps, that Mr. Arnold White stated that he was prepared to call more witnesses, but that their evidence would be of the same character, and the Committee intimated that they did not require any more?

Yes, so I understood.

8589. Lord *Monkswell.*] Do you say that in these letters, marked "private," not one of the writers gave any reason for not wishing to give evidence?

In some cases the letter was headed, "private and confidential," and in other cases the writer said, "I wish it to be treated as private and confidential."

8590. Did they not give reasons for not wishing to give evidence?

No.

8591. Not in any single case?

No.

8592. In no part of any of these letters written to you was there any suggestion as to why they did not wish to give evidence?

No; in some cases they simply said that they did not wish it to be published; they did not say why.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. WILLIAM PARNELL, having been re-called; is further Examined, as follows:

8593. *Chairman.*] I MERELY wish to ask you whether, previous to giving evidence before the Committee, you had any communication with Mr. Arnold White, or his solicitors?

Yes.

8594. Can

8594. Can you tell the Committee to what effect?
When your Lordships held your first sitting I believe Mr. Arnold White was called before you to get up the evidence respecting the Sweating System. He having, I presume, heard of my name in connection with a speech that I made describing something about sweating, wrote to me if I would assist him in getting up the evidence as far as the cabinet trade was concerned. I had an interview with Mr. Arnold White for that purpose, and he asked me how I could assist him; and I thought the best way to assist him would be to call together the leading members in the trade societies connected with the furnishing trades. I conveyed that idea to him, and he thought it would be a very good way of going to work about getting up evidence in the cabinet trade. That is how we became acquainted with the matter.

8595. With regard to the evidence that you gave, were you assisted in preparing it by Mr. Arnold White or his solicitors?
Not the least in the world. My evidence was written out entirely by myself and corrected by myself.

8596. Not submitted to them?
Not submitted to them at all. I gave Mr. Arnold White a copy of my statement; I sent it to his house the morning before Mr. Arnold White gave his opening statement here.

8597. Esrl of *Onslow*.] When was it that you first saw Mr. White upon the subject?
I could not tell you the date, but I think it was the week after you held your first sitting.

8598. It was before the first of May?
Oh, yes.

8599. Earl of *Limerick*.] You say that Mr. Arnold White asked you to give evidence generally on the sweating system in the cabinet trade?
Yes.

8600. Did he suggest in any way that that evidence should be with regard to any special firms, or as to the trade generally?
As to the trade generally; he could not suggest any particular firms, because he could not know, till the evidence was collected, how it affected particular firms.

8601. Then how was it that your evidence was more particularly directed against a special firm than to the general state of the cabinet trade?
We found in collecting the evidence that nearly the whole of it pointed to a particular shop; that is, that the system seemed to have originated in it; and although in a great many firms there were many isolated cases of oppression, there was not so many; we could not get so many witnesses who stated that they had been treated so badly in other firms.

8602. That was your sole reason?
Yes.

8603. Have you paid, or offered to pay, money to any witnesses who appeared before the Committee?
I have paid no one for appearing before the Committee.

8604. Have you offered or held out inducements to any witnesses to appear before the Committee?
No. Those people who have lost time, when I have been collecting evidence, I have paid them for their loss of time, or, rather, Mr. Arnold White has paid them through me, for the loss of time.

8605. Do those payments appear amongst the payments made by Mr. Arnold White's solicitors?
The payments were made by me direct; they simply amount to a shilling or two to a man when he lost a few hours.

8606. Did you keep any list of what payments you made?
I have not got a copy with me; but I think I could make a list out of all the payments I made.

8607. Have you been repaid those?
Yes.

8608. By whom?
Mr. Arnold White gave me a sovereign for my expenses when I was going down to the East-end getting up the evidence.

8609. And does that cover these payments as well?
Yes.

8610. It was inside a sovereign?
Yes, those payments I made were within a sovereign.

8611. Has Mr. Arnold White made any other payments through you?
Yes. Mr. Arnold White has paid the delegate that went with me down to Bethnal Green. We were there three times, and had a sovereign each for our expenses, over and above the payments to these other people.

8612. A pound each time?
No, a pound altogether.

8613. What do you mean by a delegate?
A man who was appointed to go with me.

8614. Who by?
By the committee who went to see Mr. Arnold White at first.

8615. But have any other payments, to your knowledge, been made, except the payments you mention, by any person or persons besides Mr. Arnold White, for the collection of evidence?
No; I do not know any to my own knowledge, not for the collection of evidence.

8616. These payments were not made through Mr. Arnold White's solicitors?
No.

8617. They were separate payments?
Separate payments.

8618. Earl of *Onslow.*] You say Mr. Arnold White could not have known at the time that your evidence would be directed against Maple and Company?
Yes.

8619. But was it not a notorious fact, one made public in all the newspapers, that an action was actually brought against you by Messrs. Maple?
Yes.

8620. Would it not probably have come under the knowledge of Mr. Arnold White that you had a dispute with Messrs. Maple?
Most likely he would know that; but then he would not know that the evidence we were going to collect on the Sweating System would be directed principally against Messrs. Maple.

8621. But it would naturally lead him to apply to you as a person who had had a quarrel with Messrs. Maple?
Most likely. I believe it was in consequence of my name having appeared in the papers that he did apply to me.

8622. *Chairman.*] I suppose, in your official capacity, you would be a natural person for anyone to apply to, wishing to obtain evidence about the condition of the cabinet-making and upholstery trades?
Certainly.

8623. I will not ask you any more on that point; but as you are here, perhaps you could tell the Committee whether the dates that you gave the last time

time you were before the Committee were correct; you were not certain about the date of your reply to Messrs. Maple's solicitors?

I was rather perplexed whether it was the 15th or 16th of December; I find it was the 15th of December, that was the date I wrote the letter in reply to Messrs. Lumley's letter to me.

8624. The other dates you gave are correct?

Yes.

8625. Was that the date you gave when you were last examined; the 15th of December?

Yes.

8626. All the dates you gave were correct?

All the other dates were correct.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. FREDERICK CHARLES BAUM, having been re-called; is further Examined, as follows:

8627. *Chairman.*] WERE you in communication with Mr. Arnold White or his solicitors as to the evidence you gave before the Committee?

I never came into communication with Mr. Arnold White's solicitors at all, I received a letter from Mr. Arnold White inviting me to meet him. When I met him he explained that he had been desired to collect evidence with regard to the sweating system in the cabinet trade, and he asked me as to the condition of the furnishing trades, and I then made a verbal statement to him which he asked me to put down in writing and forward to him. That I did. I received back the same statement, and that is the statement which I gave before your Lordships. I desire to add that I was neither promised any payment (we were not aware that your Lordships were going to pay the witnesses), we have not received any payment from your Lordships, and we have not received any payment whatever with regard to the evidence we have given. That applies to my knowlege to the witnesses Ham, Waltham, Brown, and Shaughnessy.

8628. You understand that when a Committee pay witnesses, the Committee merely make up the value of the time that they would lose in working at their trade in attending before the Committee and giving evidence?

There is no desire, so far as I am aware, on the part of the witnesses to claim it. I only mention that as a fact. We were not aware that there was to be any payment at all. I know that one witness declined to accept a payment from Mr. Arnold White for the time he lost, on the ground that he thought that it ought not to be paid from any private person's pocket; and, therefore, he resented the idea that he should be paid for the evidence he was giving.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. MARK MOSES, is called in, and, having been sworn; is Examined, as follows:

8629. *Chairman.*] WHAT is your business?

I am a master tailor. If you will allow me to read out my statement I will do so.

8630. I am not sure that the Committee clearly understand what you mean by a "master tailor"?

A contractor who takes work out from the wholesale houses and manufactures it on the premises.

8631. You get the work from wholesale houses and make it up on your own premises?

Yes.

8632. That is to say, you get the material and make it up?
Yes.

8633. Do you get it partly made up on your own premises?
No, we make it entirely on our premises.

8634. From beginning to end?
From beginning to end.

8635. How many hands do you employ?
About 38; occasionally 40.

8636. Men and women?
Yes.

8637. Can you tell the Committee how many men?
There are 18 men and 20 women I have now.

8638. You have got a statement which you wish to lay before the Committee?
Yes, with your permission.

8639. Will you make your statement?
I am the president of the Mutual Tailors' Association, consisting of both masters and journeymen, numbering about 230. I also represent a body of master tailors of another society, representing about 130. As far as I am able to understand Mr. Burnett's report (in which he somewhat vaguely, and I think recklessly, designates different people engaged in the trade as sweaters, middlemen, contractors, and sub-contractors). I take it that he implies that I, and others like me, who employ journeymen, are sweaters, middlemen, and sub-contractors. I am here to deny this. I will support my denial by explaining to your Lordships' Committee the actual facts as to how our branch of the trade is carried on. In the first instance, we have to arrange with a particular firm or firms to manufacture for them. Before they entrust us with any work we have to give them security. Having done this, coats are given out to us to make at a specified price. Respectable houses, such, for instance, as that I work for, viz., M. Hyam & Co., of Cannon-street, leave it entirely to one's own option to accept or reject the work at the price.

8640. Except as far as it is material for you to do so, you need not mention particular firms?
Presuming that we accept it, we engage a man porter (who makes a good living, and uses a cart or barrow) to deliver the coats at our workshops. We do not, as Mr. Burnett alleges on page 6 of his report, employ girl learners "to carry work between the warehouse and the workshop."

8641. You are speaking, I understand now, of your own business?
Yes.

8642. When you say "we," you mean "I"?
No, I mean the tailors belonging to this society, who manufacture on the same system as I do.

8643. You are speaking of the trade generally?
Of the trade generally in the East-end of London.

8644. You can only speak, I presume, of your own house in particular?
No, I can speak for the wholesale houses; that each wholesale house has one or two porters attached to the firm, to whom is entrusted the work to be delivered to the contractor.

8645. That is the way in which you conduct business yourself, you mean; and it is, in your knowledge of the trade, the general way in which business is carried on?
Yes. The master tailor having received the work, it is then made up in his own workshop, not sub-contracted to other people outside. In fact, he is not a sweater,

sweater, not a sub-contractor, but a contractor pure and simple. He himself does more towards the production of the work than the hands he employs. In addition to his own personal labour, he has to supervise and plan out every detail. In nearly every East-end tailor's workshop a distinctly original system of manufacture is carried on, invented and worked under the individual direction of the master tailor himself. (Here, I would point out, that, no matter what price he contracts to make a garment for, the wages he pays his employés do not vary.) A large employer usually has under his direction from 20 to 40 hands.

8646. I understood you to say, that what you are giving the Committee is a description of how you carry on business yourself?
Yes.

8647. And you can, of course, testify to the accuracy of it?
Yes.

8648. And that, further, you believe from your knowledge of the trade, that the trade generally is carried on in the same way?
Yes. The hands that he employs consist of a fitter, machiners, pressers, basters, button-hole makers, and fellers, to all of whom he paid fair wages. "Greeners" are of little use until they have acquired a certain amount of skill, and then they command and obtain the market price of their labour. The following table I vouch for as an actual average of the wages paid to our employés. Fitters and practical machiners earn from 7*s.* 6*d.* to 10*s.* per day; pressers, from 7*s.* to 9*s.* per day; under pressers, from 4*s.* to 7*s.* per day; basters (men), from 5*s.* to 8*s.* per day; fellers (women hands), from 2*s.* 6*d.* to 4*s.* 6*d.* per day. Button-hole makers (women), who are paid piece-work, can on an average earn 3*s.* 9*d.* per day, after deducting what they have to expend in sewing materials, these being the only hands in our trade who have to find their own sewings. I will point out to your Lordships' notice that on page 12, Mr. Burnett states on anonymous authority that a button-holer cannot earn 4*s.* per day. His informants told him that a good worker would not be able to do more than 60 holes per day, or in most exceptional cases 72. On the contrary, I will show your Lordships' Committee that a button-hole hand can easily do 84 a day, and a good worker can do 126. I am prepared to have one of the button-hole hands before you to button-hole a coat for an experiment.

8649. Are you speaking of the same class of work as Mr. Burnett is alluding to in that passage?
Yes. The reason I think this is so material is because, according to his statement, our button-hole hands could not earn the figures that I quote. The work having been made under the contractor's personal supervision, it then becomes his business to thoroughly examine each garment in every detail. Any imperfections he discovers he will have put right at his own loss; that is, he has to pay his hands for the time employed in alteration, as they do not work piece-work. When a quantity of work has been satisfactorily completed, he sends it by porter to the warehouse or shop. Upon delivery there, each garment undergoes minute examination at the hands of a man in the employment of the firm, described in the trade as a foreman. This man is usually a practical English tailor of great experience. Should the garments be not entirely to his satisfaction in make, finish, or quality of workmanship, he will return them to the contractor, for him to rectify, which he will have to do at his own loss, that is to say, he pays his hands for the time they occupy in rectification. Furthermore, he is put to the cost of paying the extra porterage thus incurred; and should any coat be so made up that it cannot be altered to the satisfaction of the foreman, it is thrown on his hands and charged to him. On page 15, Mr. Burnett estimates the profits on 40 coats at 1*s.* 2*d.* each making (which, of course, were very low ones), to be 15 s. 2*d.* per day, or (according to his own average of working days), 2*l.* 5*s.* 6*d.* per week of three days. He says here: "In the case of a sweater of, say, three machines, the estimate of the practical tailor works out in another form, thus: 1 machinist at, per day, 6*s.*; 1 at 3*s.*; and 1 at 2*s.*;

1 baster at 4 *s.*; 1 presser at 6 *s.*; 1 plain hand, for felling, &c., 1 *s.* 6 *d.*; button holes, 5 *s.*; trimmings, rent, &c., 4 *s.* This labour should, at least, turn out 40 coats per day, so that the sweater's profit is estimated at 15 *s.* 2 *d.* per day." If your Lordships will look a little higher up in the same passage, he allows a penny per coat for trimmings. He says 40 coats per day; "trimmings, rent, &c., 4 *s.*;" allowing 8 *d.* for rent, gas, firing, and porterage. His calculation, I say, is utterly wrong and misleading.. I deny that the labour can be obtained as cheaply as he says. For instance, a machiner cannot be obtained to work for 2 *s.* a day. In the whole of his report Mr. Burnett himself does not give one instance at a lower rate than 3 *s.* I also deny that 40 coats can be made in a day with so few hands as he says, namely, six; as a matter of fact another would be required. But even (for the purposes of the present argument) taking Mr. Burnett's figures for granted, I would point out that his estimate is still entirely incorrect. He has left several most important items out altogether. According to Mr. Burnett's figures, wages (three days at 27 *s.* 6 *d.* per day) is 4 *l.* 2 *s.* 6 *d.*; trimmings (120 coats at 1 *d.*), is 10 *s.*; rent I put down at 6 *s.* per week. And now I have got my figures: firing, 2 *s.*; master tailor's own wages (three days; you would allow him 7 *s.* per day), 1 *l.* 1 *s.*; wear and tear of three machines, if already paid for (which in very many instances they are not), 2 *s.* 6 *d.* per week, a very moderate sum; tea and coffee (supplied to hands gratis twice a day) 1 *s.* 6 *d.*; gas, 2 *s.*; porterage, 3 *s.* That makes a total of 6 *l.* 10 *s.* 6 *d.*

8650. I suppose you make these calculations from what you pay yourself?

Yes. Then 120 coats at 1 *s.* 2 *d.* come to 7 *l.* My cost of production, according to his own figures (I do not agree with those figures, but for arguments sake I take them) comes to 6 *l.* 10 *s.* 6 *d.* There is only a profit left of 9 *s.* 6 *d.*, and in his report he puts down the profit at 2 *l.* 5 *s.* 6 *d.* per week of three days, or 15 s. 2 *d.* a day. I will show your Lordships further what liabilities the contractor is put to. First, he has to sink a certain amount of capital. A workshop must be rented necessarily situated in a particular district adjacent to the City, such as Whitechapel or Spitalfields, where rents rule rather high. Then he is put to the expense of buying fittings for the workshop, or paying a premium to the outgoing tenant for the fittings he leaves behind him. Further, he has to purchase tables, stools, and machines. The latter are often taken on the hire system. This means that he has to pay a deposit of 10 *s.* on each machine, and the remainder of the purchase-money by instalments of 2 *s.* 6 *d.* per week. Furthermore, if he employs apprentices (who in our trade pay no premium for apprenticeship, except in very exceptional cases) he has to pay them their weekly wage all through the year, Jewish holidays and slack times included. And, of course, his liability in rent has to be met in the same way, although he may at times be only at work one or two days a week. All these liabilities are entirely lost sight of by Mr. Burnett in his Report. In addition it contains very serious inaccuracies, some of which, with the Committee's permission, I will endeavour, to the best of my ability, to point out. Mr. Burnett appears to lament the introduction of machinery into the clothing trade as an evil. On the contrary, it is a national benefit. If the so-called "sweaters" had not availed themselves of it when it was first introduced into this country, other nations would, without doubt, have had the enterprise to do so, and the result would have been that an extremely extensive industry would have been lost to this country. Englishmen, who, like other people, usually buy in the cheapest market, would at the present time be wearing imported clothing instead of the home-made article. Previous to machine-made garments being thrown on the market, the working and middle classes had to put up with second-hand and corduroy garments instead of the well-cut, well-made clothing of good material which they can now buy at first hand for a moderate sum. The extent and importance of the trade is demonstrated by Mr. Burnett himself. As your Committee will remember, he estimates our clothing exports for 1885 at 4,161,150 *l.*, and for 1886 at 3,102,211 *l.*, while out of the latter total he says, "2,606,447 *l.* was sent from the port of London." A large percentage of this

this was unquestionably manufactured by East-end Jews, and it would have been quite impossible to produce it without the aid of machinery. At the time machinery was introduced, it was as new to the much abused foreign Jewish tailor as it was to his more enlightened English confrere. Nevertheless the latter showed himself either unable or unwilling to avail himself of it; but strangely enough the ignorant foreigner grasped the opportunity, and established a large and constantly growing trade in an alien country. One result of this large increase in the trade is the employment of some thousands of non-Jewish Englishmen as buyers, managers, travellers, warehousemen, clerks, cutters, porters, &c. in the immense wholesale and retail houses which have sprung up in consequence, in addition to the increased impetus given to shipping industries, rendering more dock-labourers, case-makers, &c., necessary. Mr. Burnett says that the old-fashioned tailor is being crushed out. Instead of this, his value is, if anything, enhanced. The price paid for making hand-made garments is higher now than it ever was. On page 6, Mr. Burnett asserts that East-end Jewish tailors use "the room or one of the rooms," in which they and their families reside as a work-room. I have a very considerable knowledge of the trade; and to the best of my belief the majority of them have separate rooms as workshops. Mr. Burnett appears to imply, and Mr. Arnold White stated (when introducing a deputation to the Home Secretary on pauper immigration) that advertisements are inserted in foreign papers enticing foreigners to come to this country in order to bring down the price of labour. On behalf of the Jewish tailors, I beg most emphatically to repudiate this slander, and I challenge Mr. White, Mr. Burnett, or anybody else to cite any case of such a thing being done.

8651. Do you mean that it has never been done by the society you represent?

Yes, that is what I mean; and I can speak for the Jews generally in the East-end of London. I have made this particular question a most important point.

8652. I want to know whether you mean the Committee to understand that you deny that these advertisements are ever put into papers at all; or whether you wish the Committee to understand that they are never inserted by any society of yours?

I wish to imply that they are never inserted at all.

8653. Earl of *Onslow*.] Were you here when an advertisement was read out from a newspaper at Cardiff, which had appeared in the Jüdisch language?

I was not. You will pardon me my Lord for observing that you mention Cardiff; but I speak of London. I know nothing of provincial towns. On page 7 Mr. Burnett says, "The princes of the sweating system who employ 40 or 50 people are under no such necessity to work with their own hands, but take things easy. They as a rule have good regular work, fair prices, cheap labour, and large profits." I will make no comment on this beyond quoting Mr. Burnett's own words in contradiction of himself. On page 13 he says, "Across the way, at No. 19, is the sweating shop of Mark Moses, one of the big men of the trade, who employs from 40 to 50 people in a large well fitted workshop, built at the back of his house. Here the rates of pay vary from 8 *s.* per day for chief pressers and machinists, down to 3 *s.* for inferior hands. The button-holers, as a rule, make 3 *s.* 6 *d.* per day, but a very good day is 4 *s.*" Inasmuch as this information is obtained directly from the hands themselves in my absence——

8654. Will you go on with the quotation?

He simply states that through the obstinacy of Mrs. Moses he could not get any further information. But Mrs. Moses knew nothing about my business.

8655. Will you read on what Mr. Burnett says?

"In this case the master was from home, and the unwillingness of Mrs. Moses to give information made it extremely difficult to obtain any details; but

but a statement by Mr. Moses will be found further on." I will come to this later.

8656. *Chairman.*] You were comparing that passage with the other?

I said that, inasmuch as these figures were obtained directly from the hands, which they were, in my absence, the accuracy of the information will not be disputed; and I would ask whether it bears out Mr. Burnett's own assertion as to cheap labour, if the women are earning 3 *s.* 6 *d.* per day, and the men 8 *s.* I may here state that higher prices than this are paid in the better class trade. I do not manufacture for bespoke houses.

8657. I thought you were comparing that passage on page 13, with the passage on page 7 in reference to the question whether the "princes of the sweaters" work themselves and so on?

No, I simply want to show whether that constitutes cheap labour, as he says. On page 8, Mr. Burnett says: "Females and 'young persons' are supposed to be protected by the Factory Acts, which limit the duration of their toil to 12 hours per day, with an allowance from that of one hour for dinner, and half an hour for tea. . . . As a rule the hour for dinner is always taken, but the tea half-hour is, in very many cases, not allowed at all. If a female worker were to insist upon a regular half-hour for tea, she would be sent about her business." As far as I know, this statement is opposed to the facts. The supply of skilled female labour is much below the demand, and I should imagine no employer would be so foolish as to discharge a hand whom he could not easily replace, for the cause stated. As a matter of fact, our girls are in most workshops permitted to send out for refreshments at different times; that is, we allow our girls to send about 11 o'clock in the morning generally for something. Mr. Burnett, on page 9, asserts that in some shops the women start work at six in the morning instead of eight, and have a 14 hours' day before them. I know of no single instance of such a thing having occurred. On the contrary, it is frequently very difficult to get the women hands to begin work even at eight o'clock. I take great exception to his statement that "the inspector is regarded as the common enemy." On the contrary, he is treated by one and all with the utmost courtesy and respect. I can vouch for this on the authority of Mr. Lakeman himself, one of Her Majesty's chief inspectors, whom I made it my business to question on the point. And when Mr. Burnett says that "the signal of the inspector's presence is flashed on from house to house with almost electric speed, so that one, or at most two unexpected visits are all he can make in any one locality." He must certainly allude to something which only exists in the imagination of his informant. I have never, in the whole course of my experience, heard of such a practice being in vogue; and, on the face of it, it is most unlikely that a tradesman would voluntarily give a rival in the same line of business an advantage over himself, assisting the latter in evading the law, in order to undersell him in the market. Instead of being a "patient submissive race," as Mr. Burnett alleges, so that the employer could treat them as he likes, our employés are as a body the most independent lot of men it would be possible to find in the ranks of British or foreign artizans. It would be within the knowledge of the Committee that only a short time ago they showed their submissive demeanour by engaging in a procession through the London streets, and making an inflammatory demonstration to collect funds in aid of their fellow workers who were on strike at Leeds. Personally, I consider they had the same right as other English mechanics to take this action, and I do not blame them for so doing. I merely advert to this to show that it does not bear out Mr. Burnett's statement of their character. As to the assertion that "the men work 18 hours, minus meal times," I should very much like to be informed on what authority Mr. Burnett inserts the statement in his Report. Wherever he obtained his information, it is utterly false. A letter appeared in the "Jewish World" of 6th January 1888, signed Lazarus Goldstein, in which the writer designated himself president of the London Tailors' and Machinists' Society, a body which, I have been informed, consists of something under a dozen members. In this effusion the same untruthful statement was made.

The

The following week I myself wrote contradicting it, and challenging the writer to name the individual who employed his hands 18 hours. To that letter no reply has been received up to the present date. Perhaps it might prove of some interest to your Lordships' Committee to hear both letters read. With your permission I will read them: "Mr. John Burnett and the Master Tailors. To the Editor of the 'Jewish World.' Sir,—In last week's issue I notice a communication from Messrs. Wortman and Moses, which appears to me to look like a denial to the report of Mr. John Burnett with regard to wages, as they state that the average wages of men are from 7 *s.* to 10 *s.* per day. Now, on page 17 of the Report, I find Mr. Moses stated to Mr. Burnett, as follows: 'Men earn up to 7 *s.*, but average 5 *s.* to 6 *s.* per day.' Will you allow me through your columns, for the benefit of the public, to ask this ingenious Mr. Moses which of his statements is true?—Yours obediently, A Sweater's Victim. London, 3rd January 1888." Another letter appeared at the same time, also addressed to the Editor of the "Jewish World": "Sir,—The report in your issue of last Friday, emanating from Messrs. Moses and Wortman, presidents of the Tailors' Society, purporting to be a denial of Mr. John Burnett's Report, is entirely misleading as to facts. These gentlemen quote the prices much above the average given daily to the workers, without explaining that those wages are paid for labour often extending to 17 hours per day at a stretch. They do not tell the public of the horrible sweating system under which the men work. No worker knows when he starts work, what his earnings will be, on account of the three-quarter day, half, or quarter-day system which is all they have during some weeks. I am a presser of 15 years' standing, and have never heard of or received such a high wage as Messrs. Moses and Wortman speak of. They must have made a mistake, and surely mean the average weekly wages of their workers during the year. I say and will maintain, that the unhealthy workshops and irregular hours and system under which we work and the way in which the the law is evaded, are a disgrace to civilisation. Yours obediently, Lazarus Goldstein, President of the London Tailors and Machinists Society." This is my answer, "To the Editor of the 'Jewish World.' Sir,—In reply to the letter in your last week's issue signed, 'A Sweater's Victim,' I beg to say that it contains within a very small compass more mis-statements and fabrications than I am accustomed to expect in communications of the same reckless and sensational character. In the first place the statement attributed to me on page 17 of Mr. Burnett's Report was never made by me to anybody. In the second place it is not asserted by Mr. Burnett himself that he personally obtained it from my own lips, as stated by your correspondent. Had "A Sweater's Victim" read the report in its entirety, I imagine that he would not have placed himself in such a ridiculous position. Mr. Burnett (with what measure of accuracy I am, of course, not in a position to know) prints a statement, which he asserts was made by me to a third party as long as four years ago. My answer to Mr. Burnett is simply a flat denial. I leave to him and the third party the task of settling the responsibility of publishing this mis-statement between themselves. Before closing this hurried note, allow me to ask your second correspondent (who, by-the-bye, has the manliness to sign his name) what master tailor he alludes to as having often kept him at work for 17 hours per day at a stretch, for one day's pay; as the information would be highly interesting to me. Such a man (a sweater in reality) should be known and gibbeted on the stocks of public opinion. In conclusion, I beg to state that I decline, for the future, to be led into a continuation of further personal controversy on the side issues of this question. The main question is before the public. I have repeatedly challenged investigation into the truth of my own statements upon it. I still challenge that investigation. Yours faithfully, M. Moses." Another statement directly opposed to truth is the assertion——

8658. What do you allude to now; are you alluding to Mr. Burnett's Report?

Yes. Another statement directly opposed to truth is the assertion that no overtime is paid. I think several witnesses have made that very same statement;

ment; I noticed it last Tuesday in the evidence of the secretary of the East-end branch, I believe. As a matter of fact, our men would refuse to work beyond their time without they received extra money for so doing. They frequently refuse to work overtime, even though they are paid for it. The most absurd allegation in the whole of Mr. Burnett's Report is that on page 9, which, for convenience, I had, perhaps, better read. This is, I think, the most damaging of all. He says about the middle of the page, "The sweater so arranges matters that all the work to be done must be got out on the three last days of the week. Thus he will send for his hands, or so many of them as he may require, to start on Thursday morning, and tells them he has received a certain quantity of work which must be out by the Friday night, or the Saturday morning. Work will then commence at seven o'clock on the morning of Thursday, and go on right through the night, and up to four o'clock on the Friday afternoon. If there is a special pressure of work, real or imaginary, it will be carried on to six or seven o'clock in the evening. For this spell of from 33 to 36 hours, the men will receive two days' pay. If they are called upon to work fractions of a day, eight hours is a half-day, and four hours a quarter day. The fact that there are two Sabbaths in the week, the English and the Jewish, is found very convenient by some of the sweaters, who avail themselves of this circumstance by observing neither, if it suits their convenience to work on both." It is a gross slander upon the master tailors of East London to assert, as he does, that during the slack time they take a mean advantage of their hands by working them for 36 hours at a stretch. To show how ridiculous it is, I will point out how entirely against his own interests such a course of action would be on the part of the master tailor. During the slack time, when the competition to obtain what work there is is necessarily great, it is obviously to a man's own interest to get his work made as quickly as possible. For the man who has most work at home, un-made, is naturally in the worst position to ask for more. Speaking from my own practical experience, I know very well that when I apply for fresh work, the first thing the foreman does is to ascertain how much I have out. Should he find I have a proportionately larger supply than other hands in the same line, he naturally would give the preference, in giving out the work, to those who have the least. Knowing this, we all strive to make our work up and send it in as quickly as we possibly can, instead, as Mr. Burnett asserts, of hoarding it up till the end of the week, and then working abnormal hours to get it done, with the risk of being heavily fined for violating the law. In fact, Mr. Burnett's statement, from whatever source derived, is in direct contradiction to the fact. At the same time, while denying that the evil exists to the extent affirmed, I am willing to admit that in the bespoke trade a great deal of unnecessary extra pressure exists. This, however, is not the fault of the master tailor. The blame is attributed to the wrong person. The responsibility for this over-pressure rests, not upon the master tailors, but upon their employers in bespoke shops. Undoubtedly a lamentable amount of bad management is exercised there. Much has been said of the bad treatment with which, it is alleged, the master tailors have treated their employés——

8659. Before you leave the former point, I want to ask you a question. You say that this account which Mr. Burnett gives of the way in which the sweater keeps the work back to the end of the week is entirely incorrect?

It is.

8660. In the first place, do you mean to say that you never do it yourself?

No, I do not do it myself.

8661. In the second place, I suppose you mean that it is never done to your knowledge?

It is not.

8662. But you want the Committee to understand also that it is never done at all?

I will state that it is never done at all. Of course, a man would not get work

work out while he has a lot of work at home unfinished; and the man that made his work up the earliest would get the preference. I have said that I want to point out to your Lordships where the evil exists. I have mentioned bespoke shops. Orders which the latter (the bespoke shops) receive in the early part of the week are neglected and not cut till the last moment, thus producing an undue accumulation at the end of the week.

8663. By the bespoke shops you mean the large wholesale shops, I suppose?
No, the shops which are situated in the City, the retail shops.

8664. Not shops that get their work done by you?
Yes, they would be the same shops. I said before, wholesale and retail; these would be retail shops. While the bespoke tailors are kept comparatively idle up to Wednesday, they are inundated with an exceptional quantity of orders which they are compelled to execute by Friday or Saturday, at the risk of being fined or discharged by the shopkeepers. In many instances the shopkeeper would rectify the neglect of his cutter, if he were made aware of it; but the tailor is debarred from exposing the evit to him because the cutter is practically his (the tailor's) sole master. It is the cutter who usually gives out his work to him, and also examines it when it is made. Therefore it does not do for the tailor to be in the cutter's bad books.

8665. What do you mean by a "tailor"?
I call myself a tailor.

8666. You are alluding to yourself and to the people in the same position as yourself?
Yes. His mouth is completely closed, and he has to suffer in silence. Furthermore, it frequently happens that garments have to be altered by the tailor owing to mistakes on the cutter's part, for which very little, or nothing, is paid. Should an alteration take five hours to do, the tailor is very often paid the price of only one hour's work. The reason is, that by signing the tailor's check for the full amount of work, the cutter would expose his own bad cutting.

8667. Will you explain that a little more?
An alteration is sent out to a tailor with a ticket on stating what is required to be done. The tailor will make this alteration; he will say, so many hours, and the cutter will have to sign this check.

8668. What do you mean by "check"?
Paper or label; we call it a check in the trade. The cutter would have to sign this check entitling the tailor to be paid. The cutter often refuses to sign those checks because it would expose his own bad cutting.

8669. What I understand you to mean is this, that there is something wrong with the work when it comes in?
No. A gentleman may come in and order a coat, and it may not fit him exactly when it is sent home to him.

8670. I will put it in this way: Some alteration is required to be made in the work?
Yes.

8671. And the work is sent back to the tailor?
Yes.

8672. With a label which you call a check stating what is to be done to it?
Yes.

8673. The tailor then sends it back with the amount of time that the work has occupied, upon the check?
No; he will tell the forman that it has taken so many hours.

 8674. What

8674. What do you mean by "the foreman," the cutter?
The cutter.

8675. He informs the cutter how much time it has occupied?
Yes.

8676. And I understand that if the cutter signs the check you say that would show his own bad work?
Undoubtedly; because the cutter takes the measure from a customer; he cuts the coat, gives it out to the tailor, and receives it from him.

8677. And I understand you to say that in order to hide his own mistakes, the cutter refuses to sign the check?
Undoubtedly. I can produce witnesses before your Lordships' Committee of know integrity and respectability, engaged in the bespoke trade, who are prepared to assure your Lordships that they have received work out at seven o'clock on a Monday evening, the same work being ordered in on their labels by nine o'clock Monday morning (I have seen those labels myself); that is, the coats are ordered to be made some hours before they receive them. This shows that there has been great delay in cutting, as, presumably, the clerk who writes the labels copies them from the customer's order. It sometimes happens that if the customer cancels the order the garment is put into stock, and the tailor is only paid stock price for making; meaning very often about half the order price. This is a very serious statement. I have two or three witnesses of the greatest respectability that are known by a great authority in the district. If you will examine those witnesses privately they will be only too pleased to come forward; but being known men in the bespoke trade, if they were to come here and give evidence in public, they would be certainly not employed in the trade. This is a serious statement, and I can substantiate every word that I say. I will here give your Lordships one illustration, typical of many others, of the system pursued in a big City house largely engaged in the bespoke trade (I will not trouble you with many; I will give you one case), and that is C. J. Kino, Fenchurch-street. It is their rule to pay once a week, namely, every Friday, for stock work received up to ten o'clock on the previous Wednesday morning. Stock sent in after that is not paid for until the following Friday week.

8678. Do you say this is an exceptional case in the trade?
Each house has a different system, but I think this is a very bad one. Orders sent in up to Thursday are paid for on Friday also. This system is carried out in the following manner: Suppose a tailor delivers a line of say 50 coats (a certain number of coats, we should call in the trade a "line," 50, 60, or 100) on Monday, continuing to send in other work during the week; on Thursday he sends for the checks, entitling him to be paid on the Friday.

8679. By the checks you mean these labels?
Yes. Should the most trivial fault be found with one coat out of the 50, his check for the whole line is kept back, and he will not be paid for those 50 coats till the following Friday, that is 12 days after they were sent in, although the fault could easily have been rectified previous to Wednesday 10 o'clock. That means that if a man had 50 coats out, and he sends them in on Monday, they may not be examined immediately in his presence, and he would leave these coats there; he would send on the Thursday for his checks entitling him to payment; they would give him one of those coats back, and by that rule he would not get paid for the whole of the 50 coats until the Friday week. With reference to orders, it is a well-known fact that the bulk of them come at the end of week, so that they cannot possibly be delivered till Friday and Saturday——

8680. Do you mean bespoke?
It is a wholesale and bespoke house, thereby keeping back his hardly earned money from the master tailor for a week or ten days, while, in the meantime he on his part, is necessarily obliged to find money somehow to pay his hands. When eventually he does receive the money due to him, it happens, in nine cases out of ten, that several shillings are deducted. The only satisfaction he gets in reply to his natural inquiries as to the reason for this proceeding is contained

tained in the simple word "Buttons," or go and find it out. That is the only answer he gets. This means that if a button was not exactly in the right place, a matter which would take two or three minutes to put right, a fine of 6 *d.* is levied in each instance in which it has occurred, or is supposed to have occurred. Of course the tailor does not know whether it has occurred; the coats are left there; they are not examined in his presence; the tailor does not know whether there was anything wrong. Should one of these tickets (*producing a ticket*) which is of a very nominal value be slightly soiled or damaged, although this may have occurred in the shop itself previous to the garment reaching the tailor or the foreman, a fine of sixpence is imposed. I know a man, Mr. Abraham Goldman, of 3 Great Garden-street, Whitechapel, who worked for the firm of Messrs. Kino, but on account of these deductions he left the firm and sued the firm for such reductions and wages; but, no doubt acting upon legal advice, Mr. Kino thought it his best policy to pay the amount into court. The amount he sued Mr. Kino for costs was 9 *l.* 11 *s.* Your Lordships may have noticed that this ticket is inscribed with the words "Economy, Fashion, Quality," leading people to believe that Mr. Kino's business is conducted upon the first principle at least, namely, economy.

8681. How can you speak of the way in which the business of another person is conducted?

It is conducted on the principle of economy if he keeps on fining people for a very trivial fault.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. PERCY HERBERT ATKINSON, having been re-called, is further Examined, as follows:

8682. Earl of *Onslow.*] I understood you to say that in none of the letters that you wrote, asking for evidence, had you requested that that evidence should be specially directed against the firm of Messrs. Maple and Co.?

Yes.

8683. A letter has been put into my hands which I should like to read to you; it is addressed to "Mr. Jones, Messrs. Walker & Co., 113, Bunhill-row," and dated "33, Gracechurch-street, London, 15th May 1888." Dear Sir,—Sweating in the cabinet trade. We understand that you can give valuable evidence in connection with this subject, and particularly with Messrs. Maple's dealings with the trade. If so, we shall be glad to see you to-morrow, or on Thursday between 12 and 2. We are acting for Mr. Arnold White. Yours truly, *Terrell and Atkinson.*" Did you write that letter (*handing the letter to the Witness*)?

Yes. I did not recollect it.

8684. Then that would be an exception?

Yes. I had no recollection of it.

8685. Do you recollect writing a letter of the same kind to Mr. Woodward?

I wrote so many letters.

8686. Perhaps you wrote so many that you do not remember whether you did ask for evidence against Messrs. Maple?

My impression was that I wrote generally.

8687. But that is evidently your letter?

In that case I must have had information that he could give evidence about Messrs. Maple?

8688. And that might have happened in other cases?

It might.

8689. *Chairman.*] Are you aware that Mr. Arnold White was informed by the Committee that they would receive evidence corroborative of Miller's statements concerning Messrs. Maple's firm, if such evidence was forthcoming.

No, I was not.

8690. Mr. Arnold White did not tell you so?
No.

8691. You are not aware that he told any other member of the firm so?
No, not to my knowledge.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. JULIUS ADOLP DEINTJE, having been re-called, is further Examined, as follows:

8692. *Chairman.*] I WANT to read you portions of a letter which has been sent to the Committee, written by Mr. Marcus H. Lewis to Messrs. Lumley and Lumley. Is Mr. Marcus H. Lewis your solicitor?
Yes.

8693. This letter says: "Dear Sirs,—The Sweating System. At your request I herewith send you statement, or proof sent to my client, Mr. Deintje, which purported to be the statement made to Messrs. Terrell and Atkinson, Mr. Arnold White's solicitors, but which, as I am instructed, was not correct, and in some respects not true. Mr. Deintje made a statement generally upon the sweating system, and the same was taken down by Messrs. Terrell and Atkinson's shorthand clerk." What took place?
I commenced making a statement in general, but I was informed by the clerk that they did not wish to know anything about any other firms except about Messrs. Maple & Co.

8694. Then that portion of this letter written by your solicitor is not correct?
Yes. I did go on with the general statement to a certain length.

8695. I want yes or no to this: "Mr. Deintje made a statement generally upon the sweating system, and the same was taken down by Messrs. Terrell and Atkinson's shorthand clerk"; is that correct?
Yes, that is so.

8696. The letter goes on: "Much to my client's astonishment, the statement sent to him was, comparatively speaking, short, and only related, or more particularly so, to his dealing with Messrs. Maple & Co. The document in question was so worded as to lead anyone reading the same to come to the conclusion that he had been badly treated by that firm. It would seem that his statements relating to the other firms, and the sweating system generally, had been struck out;" is that correct?
That is correct.

8697. Then the postscript of the letter is: "I forgot to mention that Mr. Deintje told me that while he was making his statement to Messrs. Terrell & Atkinson's clerk, the latter said that Mr. Deintje must confine himself to the transactions he had had with Messrs. Maple & Co., as they did not want to know anything about any other firm; but Mr. Deintje declined, and made a general statement." Is that correct?
I told them that I should not go on with the statement; if I came up as a witness, I could speak without having a statement made; that I knew perfectly well what to say. He was going to take a further statement down against Messrs. Maple's, which I did not feel inclined to, and I told him I could speak very well here without having a statement written out for me.

8698. But is it correct that you did make a general statement to Messrs. Terrell & Atkinson's clerk?
I did.

8699. And is it correct that the statement which they sent to you was not the general statement that you made?
There was a lot left out, and what I said was worded in quite a different way from what I had said, altogether different.

The Witness was directed to withdraw.

12*th July* 1888.

MR. JOSEPH TREGENNA, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

8700. *Chairman.*] You are a clerk in the employment of Messrs. Terrell and Atkinson?
I am.

8701. Were you employed in taking down shorthand notes of the statements that these witnesses made to Messrs. Terrell and Atkinson?
I took a note of Mr. Deintje's statement.

8702. I will read you out this, and ask you if it is correct. This is what purported to be Mr. Deintje's statement: "Mr. J. A. Deintje, of 66, Cheniesmews, Francis-street, Tottenham Court-road, cabinet-maker, states as follows: I have been engaged in the cabinet manufactory business for about 30 years, and have been in England for about 22 years past. I am a high-class manufacturer and prepare designs and work them out. I have worked for most of the largest manufacturing houses in London. I have had many orders from Maple & Co., and worked for them up to the last General Election, at which election I voted for the Radical M.P. for South Saint Pancras, and on going to Maples for orders Mr. Maples, Senior, asked me what I wanted, and he told me to leave the premises and never go there again. His son was the Conservative candidate for the same division. When Maple gave me an order I complied with it, and delivered the goods, and upon many occasions, when the goods have been delivered, the invoices handed in and I have applied for payment, my prices have been beaten down from the original figures agreed upon from 1 *l.* to 10 *l.* I have refused to accept a cheque under such conditions, and called again the following week. The same cheque would be handed to me, and, thinking it the better course to accept it, and not trouble to fight the question out, I consented to receive such cheques in discharge of my invoices. On one occasion I went to Maple's when a large amount had been taken off, and Mr. Maple persuaded me to take what he offered, saying he would make it up in other work, and told me he would make me a present of a bottle of wine, and I could go to Hampstead Heath and enjoy myself. I have not had the wine yet. Beyond the amounts so deducted by Maple & Co., they have also deducted 2½ per cent. from my work. Maples were also in the habit of obtaining my original designs as worked out, and getting them copied by other manufacturers, and then having the cabinets made up in a cheaper style and a much inferior article. On many occasions I have had orders from Maples and they have been countermanded, the goods have been received by them when I have agreed to accept a lower price, and they were then added to their stock. My goods were all put outside in the street upon one occasion because I refused to make any deduction." Is that the transcript you made of your notes.
That is the transcript.

8703. And is it a correct transcript of the notes you took down?
That is a correct transcript.

8704. Did you take down all that Mr. Deintje said?
I did.

8705. And in that transcript you omitted nothing?
I omitted nothing, not one word.

8706. Earl of *Limerick.*] Have you got your shorthand notes?
I have (*handing them to Lord Limerick*).

8707. *Chairman.*] Do you know whether any other clerk was employed in taking shorthand notes?
I was employed with Mr. Deintje all the time.

8708. Earl of *Onslow.*] Only with Mr. Deintje?
I had to do with other witnesses.

8709. *Chairman.*] I want to know whether, to your knowledge, any other clerk took down any portion of this statement, or any other statement of Mr. Deintje's?

I can swear that no other clerk had anything to do with Mr. Deintje, and that I solely took down that statement and transcribed it direct from my book, from Mr. Deintje's own mouth.

8710. Earl of *Limerick.*] Is it the case that you, or anybody in your hearing, said to him that he must confine his statement to matters relating to Mr. Maple?

There was a conversation with regard to the letter that had appeared just about that time, stating that my principals were prepared to receive evidence with regard to the Sweating System; and we talked about that with Mr. Deintje, and he said that he was prepared to give us that evidence; and my principal instructed me there and then to take down what he was prepared to say.

8711. But you did not say that he was to confine himself to any special firm?

I did not.

8712. Earl of *Onslow.*] Was your principal present at the same time?

My principal in the first instance was engaged, and he directed me to go into a room with Mr. Deintje and take down his statement simply.

8713. Lord *Monkswell.*] I understand that you were alone during the greater part of the time that the statement was take down?

I was.

8714. The whole time?

A part of the time; my principal became disengaged, and then he came into the room to see how I was progressing with Mr. Deintje?

8715. When he came into the room was there any conversation between him and Mr. Deintje?

There was a general conversation of no particular character; he simply told me to go on and finish with Mr. Deintje, and then read it over to him.

8716. Did you observe any hesitation on the part of Mr. Deintje in giving evidence?

None whatever.

8717. And this which you have shown us is the very transcript you sent to Mr. Deintje as being his evidence?

Yes.

8718. That very copy, or did you copy it again?

No, this is not my copy, this is a copy from mine.

8719. Earl of *Onslow.*] Look at this (*handing a document to the Witness*).

This is mine.

8720. Lord *Monkswell.*] Is that the very statement sent to Mr. Deintje, or was that copied by anybody and sent to Mr. Deintje?

I should imagine this (*pointing to a document marked A.*) might have been the copy sent to him, and the original kept, that in my handwriting.

8721. Those are the same, are they?

Yes, they would be examined before they went out of the office.

8722. One of these papers is the original transcript, and the other the copy sent to Mr. Deintje?

One is the original from my notes, and the other is a copy.

Mr. *Atkinson.*] The copy I gave the Chairman, and which I handed in, is the original transcript; the other one is the one we sent to Deintje.

Witness.] I might add that I had not the least motive whatever for either adding one word to or taking one word from Mr. Deintje's evidence.

8723. Lord

8723. Lord *Monkswell.*] Did you observe anything like an altercation between Mr. Deintje and your principal?
Not in the slightest; he gave the evidence he did give with the utmost freedom.

8724. Earl of *Onslow.*] You cannot distinctly say that you did not say to Mr. Deintje that he must confine himself to the transactions he had had with Messrs. Maple and Company, that you did not want to have anything about any other firm?
No, I did not say that.

8725. And it was not said by your principal in your presence?
No.

The Witness was directed to withdraw.

MR. JULIUS ADOLP DEINTJE, having been re-called; is further Examined, as follows:

8726. *Chairman.*] WILL you look at that (*handing the statement marked A. to the Witness*). Is that the copy of your statement that was sent to you?
Yes, that is the one; I did not mark it.

8727. You think that is the one?
I think that is the one.

8728. And did you give that to your solicitor?
I did.

8729. Mr. Marcus H. Lewis?
I did.

8730. Then that is the statement alluded to in the letter that I read?
Exactly so.

8731. Do you consider that that is a correct transcript of what you stated?
It is not. When I first came to Terrell & Atkinson's, I saw Mr. Atkinson, and he was busily engaged, and he handed me over to his clerk; and we went into a private room, and he sat himself before the table and wrote while I was speaking to him. He did not write one quarter down of what I said; he only wrote now and again. Now and again he wrote what I said; not one quarter what I did say. And when I spoke about other firms (I do not wish to mention the names of them, because it would damage me in the trade, in the firms which I do with). When I was going to give information as to the houses I was doing with, he said, "We do not want any other information except about Maple's."

8732. The last witness said that, you mean?
This clerk, who took my statement down. Mr. Atkinson did not come in the room all the time; but, as soon as I had completed and finished with him, Mr. Terrell came in.

8733. What I understand, then, is that you say it is not a correct transcript of what you said, and that a good deal that you did say was simply suppressed in this transcript?
That is so.

8734. Lord *Thring.*] Did you give any evidence to anybody except the short hand clerk who appeared here?
No, I have not seen anybody.

8735. You said nothing to anyone else?
Except Parnell, the cabinet-maker.

8736. But at Messrs. Atkinson's, I mean?
Not a word to anybody else.

8737. All you said was said to Tregenna, the last Witness?
Yes; I do not remember anything that transpired with anybody else, excepting talking about the general——

8738. *Chairman.*] You said that you mentioned the names of some firms which you would prefer not mentioning before the Committee, because it might damage you?
Yes

8739. Do you remember making any request to the shorthand clerk that he should not put down the names of the firms, because it might damage you?
I did not.

Mr. *Atkinson.*] Would you ask him, my Lord, whether, after he received the copy of his evidence, he took any objection to it?

8740-1. *Chairman.*] What did you do when you received this paper?
I received this paper the day after I received the summons from the House of Lords. By post it came.

8742. What did you do when you received it?
I put it in my drawer and left it at home; did not take any notice of it at all; and I said to myself that I should go and give the evidence as I had experienced it in the trade.

8743. It says in the letter that you were much surprised at the statement, "Much to my client's astonishment, the statement sent to him was, comparatively speaking, short," and so on; you were surprised when you received the statement?
I was not so much surprised, seeing the way they were pressing the evidence against Maple; I was not surprised to see the way it was worded.

8744. You were not surprised?
I was not surprised at the way it was worded. They wanted the evidence— —

8745. Did you make any objection to that statement when you received it?
I should have made an objection to it had it been——

8746. I asked you whether you did make an objection?
No, I took no notice of it.

8747. Why did you not make any objection?
It was totally wrong. I left it at home; I ignored it altogether.

8748. Lord *Thring.*] Then I understand this, that when this copy of the evidence was sent to you, you ignored it altogether, and put in a drawer?
I put it in my drawer, and left it there.

8749. And then did you go to your own solicitors?
That was after I had given my evidence here, when Mr. Arnold White brought a charge against me.

8750. Then I understand you to say, that although you knew at the time when you received this statement that it did not contain a true version of your evidence, you did not go to Messrs. Atkinson and say, "You have sent me an untrue version of my evidence"?
No.

8751. But you took no notice of it?
No, I took no notice of it.

8752. You never gave them notice that you were going to the House of Lords, and intended to give this evidence?
I was not aware that this evidence was before your Lordships at all.

8753. I do not ask you that. You were actually aware that that statement was

was given to you as being a true version of your evidence; it was sent to you by Messrs. Atkinson?

I did not take it like that.

8754. Was it not sent to you by Messrs. Atkinson, and did you not think that they believed it was a true statement of your evidence?

No, I do not believe they did believe that.

8755. You made no objection to that statement to Mr. Atkinson first or last, and did not say, "You have sent me an untrue statement"?

No.

8756. But you came to the House of Lords and gave evidence, and then instructed your solicitor?

No, not like that; I should not have gone to my solicitor at all, had Mr. Arnold White not ——

8757. I do not ask you the why or the wherefore; but when you left the House of Lords you did not go to Messrs. Atkinson, but went to your own solicitor, and instructed him to write that letter which we have heard?

Exactly so.

8758. Lord *Clinton.*] You did that after you had heard or seen the evidence given by Mr. Arnold White after you had given your's?

Yes, exactly so.

8759. *Chairman.*] I understand you to mean that what you wish the Committee to understand is this: that this statement was so contrary to what you said, that you put it aside as valueless?

Yes.

8760. But that when some objection was taken to the evidence that you gave before the Committee as not being in accordance with the statement you had made, then you sent it to your solicitor and gave the instructions for this letter; is not that what you mean?

After Mr. Arnold gave his evidence after mine against me, then I went to my solicitor.

8761. Mr. Arnold White gave evidence against you, do you say?

Yes.

8762. Lord *Clinton.*] What evidence did he give against you?

He said that I had been tampered with, and had been seen speaking to Maple's manager, and that I was giving evidence here different to a sworn information I had given elsewhere. I most decidedly swear that the clerk did not write every word down that I said, because he did not use the pen constantly; he only used the pen when it suited him.

8763. Lord *Monkswell.*] You say the clerk sometimes took down what you said; but do you say that he took down anything which you did not say. Here is your statement here, and you say this is not a full statement of what you said, because he did not take down everything you said; but do you mean to say that he invented anything you did not say?

For instance, about the cheque, it is worded altogether different to the way I said it. I told him in a proper way that I had on one occasion a dispute with Maples about a cheque, and when I came to the counting-house I found that the cheque was for less money than it ought to have been. I did not go again till the following Saturday; and I found the same cheque was handed over to me; and I was told by the clerk that they could not alter it, but I must see the manager, but I did not; I took my cheque and went away; I thought it not worth while to have a trouble and create a dispute with a house I was doing business with. In that sense I gave it, but it has been worded quite different

8764. Then your complaint is not only that the clerk left out things which you said but also that he misrepresented what he did take down?

He worded it different.

8765. In this statement you certainly bring in something in the nature of a charge against Mr. Maple; at all events you say that he gave you a cheque for a less amount than you considered was agreed between you?
Yes.

8766. And if you refer to your other evidence I find you say that when Mr. Maple did that he only did it because the work was bad. You seem to have changed your opinion between?
No. Then I was speaking upon another subject altogether; that does not refer to a cheque; a deduction does not mean that.

8767. I suppose the cheque was of the amount that it was on account of a deduction?
There was a deduction.

8768. The deduction was made by that cheque and you say in this first evidence, if you are correctly taken down, that this deduction was unfair on the part of Messrs. Maple?
I did not say so.

8769. That is what it is there (*pointing to the statement*)?
Yes. I believe if I had gone and seen the head of the firm about that cheque, it would have been rectified?

8770. If you believe that if you had gone to the head of the firm it would have been rectified, you must believe that an unfair deduction had been made. If it was a fair deduction, it would not have been rectified?
That must be so; but it is worded very stiff there.

8771. *Chairman.*] Have you had any conversation with Mr. Parnell on the subject?
Mr. Parnell called on me twice. The first time he called on me was in reference to a prosecution of Mr. Blundell Maple against him, and he wanted me to come up as a witness against Mr. Blundell Maple. I told him that I could not implicate myself.

8772. Have you had any conversation with Mr. Parnell about this matter?
About this matter; he called on me and asked me whether I was supplying Maple. I told him no, I was not doing anything with him. He asked me if I had any evidence to give——

8773. I am asking you whether you have had any conversation about this particular point, about this statement of your's?
No, not about the statement; I have never seen him since.

8174. Did you have a conversation with him before you gave your evidence?
Before I made the statement at Mr. Atkinson's.

8175. Did you tell him what you were going to say to Mr. Atkinson?
No, I did not know what questions I should be asked there.

8176. But we are talking of the statement that was taken down by the shorthand clerk at Messrs. Atkinson's; I ask you whether you told Mr. Parnell what you were going to say to the clerk?
I do not remember; I do not think anything at all transpired when he called.

8777. Lord *Thring.*] You cannot say that you did not?
I did not enter into any details whatever with him; I know that.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. WILLIAM PARNELL, having been re-called, is further Examined, as follows:

8778. *Chairman.*] Did you have any interview or any conversation with Mr. Deintje previous to his going to Messrs. Terrell and Atkinson to have his statement taken down for his evidence?
Yes.

8779. And

8779. And did he tell you at all what he proposed to say?

He did not tell me what he proposed to say to them, but he made a statement to me as far back as the 1st of February. Of course, when I was seeking evidence to defend the action that Mr. Maple brought against me, and knowing that Mr. Deintje is a cabinet-maker, who had worked for Maple, I went to him to know if he could assist me in my defence. He made a statement to me there on the 1st February, in the presence of two other people. In the course of conversation, he told me that he should not come forward to give evidence on my behalf; but in the course of conversation he told me several very important things in reference to his dealings with Maple; and there were two others with me who would substantiate what I shall say. Mr. Deintje's statement was almost identical with the statement which your Lordship read out since I have been in this room. What he told Messrs. Terrell and Atkinson, of course I do not know; but after I had given evidence before your Lordships I was informed that Mr. Deintje was willing to come forward and give evidence. I went to him again and told him the names of Mr. Arnold White's solicitors, Messrs. Terrell and Atkinson; and in the course of conversation again he went through very nearly a similar statement to what he had told me before; and, amongst other things, besides that (I say this to call back Mr. Deintje's memory) he mentioned that he had made a satin wood suite of furniture for Lebus' own drawing-room in the course of conversation. We had a long conversation. When I went to see him he met me with the words, "You are the very man I wanted to see." We had a long conversation then, and walked down as far as Holborn together. Mr. Deintje, in the course of his conversation with me on the 1st of February, stated that in one particular instance he had made a cabinet for Messrs. Maple, and he had been asked to repeat the same article——

8780. I do not think you need go into that. I understand from you that the statement which I read out just now is, according to your recollection and belief, pretty much the same as the statement which Mr. Deintje made to you on the 1st of February and subsequently, before he went to Messrs. Terrell and Atkinson?

Yes. I have notes of that first conversation, and two witnesses who can prove that these notes are correct, if your Lordship chooses to see them or the witnesses.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be Adjourned to To-morrow, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Veneris, 13° *Julii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of CANTERBURY.
Earl of ONSLOW.
Lord CLINTON.
Lord CLIFFORD OF CHUDLEIGH.
Lord FOXFORD (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord MONKSWELL.
Lord THRING.

THE EARL OF ONSLOW, IN THE CHAIR.

MR. MARK MOSES, having been re-called; is further Examined, as follows:

8781. *Chairman.*] WILL you go on with the statement that you were making yesterday?

Another shop in which the same arbitrary and unjust spirit is shown is that of Messrs. Smith and Macqueen, Cheapside. It is their rule to give out the work unpriced. Each garment is accompanied by a label upon which there is a blank space left for the "price of workmanship," but this is never filled in when the tailor receives it. In order to receive payment, the tailor is required to send in these labels at the end of the week. When he does so, Messrs. Smith and Macqueen pay him exactly what they think fit. As a rule they do not pay too much. Should a tailor have the temerity to ask what price he will be paid when he takes a coat out to make, he is informed that it is against the rules of the firm to tell him, and that if he is not willing to comply with that system of business he can leave the shop. I have obtained this information from a bespoke tailor who has worked for Smith and Macqueen for some years, and whose integrity I can vouch for. Should it be your Lordships' wish, I am prepared to bring him here, on condition that he is examined privately, as it would injure him in his business if his identity were make public. If examined under those conditions, he is prepared to give much fuller information than I am able to do. A great point has been made of the fact that West-end and City houses have their work made in what the sensation mongers term "the sweating dens in the East-end." Surely your Lordships' Committee will agree with me that the atmosphere of a well-ventilated East-end workshop is preferable to that of an underground cellar situate in the City of London, or in a living room in the top garret of a tumble-down house in the back slums of the West-end. For it is notorious that those City houses who have their work made on the premises, have, owing to the high rental they have to pay, no other accommodation for their indoor hands than basement cellars, where gas is used the whole day long. I will mention the names of one or two firms where this is the case.

8782. What are you going to say that they do?

They have men in the basement at the manufactories in the City where gas is used the whole day long.

8783. I think you had better omit the names?

Very well; I will submit to your Lordship's instruction.

8784. You may describe them, and give the names of the streets they are in?—One is in Queen Victoria-street, City, and another is in Queen-street, Cheapside.

Cheapside. With your Lordships' permission, I will now turn to another branch of the subject. This question, popularly described as the sweating system, has occupied the attention of a number of philanthropic, well-meaning ladies and gentlemen, possessing little or no practical acquaintance with their subject. In their honest desire to do good they have, many of them, overstepped the bounds of common sense and sober reason. Claptrap articles in the Press, uncorroborated *ex parte* statements from the mouths of persons having everything to gain and nothing to lose by figuring prominently in the agitation, have perhaps naturally imposed upon their generous instinct to such an extent that in the overflow of their enthusiasm they have proposed remedies for an evil largely imaginative which would prove ridiculously unworkable in practice. A much-wanted suggestion, charming in its *naïve* simplicity, has been the simple annihilation of the contractor, or, as they prefer to term him, the middleman. Two methods have been mooted for carrying on the trade without him. First, the establishment of workshops by the wholesale firms, where all garments shall be manufactured on the premises; secondly, the establishment of outside workshops by the work hands themselves, to be conducted upon the co-operative principle. I would point out that both have already been tried, and failed dismally. The first alternative necessitates the expenditure of capital on the part of the wholesale house by the employment of a manager to displace the outside contractor, by the rental of the factory premises, and by the usual working expenses of gas, fittings, machinery, &c. Of course, the manager, unlike the contractor, would not contribute any manual labour himself. His duties would constitute superintendence alone. Receiving as he would a fixed salary, not affected by the variation in prices caused by the difference in good and common work, or busy and slack seasons, he would not possess the direct personal interest in the business which animates the contractor, whose own income is governed by these fluctuations. The natural result would be either a reduction in the wages of the workers to meet the increased liabilities, or increased prices being charged for goods with no advantage to the workers, and a decided disadvantage to the public. I have also on my notes one or two firms, large City houses, where this has been tried and failed, but your Lordship has pointed out to me that you wished me to leave the names out. The second scheme was attempted about three years ago by a number of hands who occupied a workshop in Tenter-street Buildings, Whitechapel, although they were provided with capital by the charitable assistance of D. F. Schloss, Esquire, of 2 Portugal-place, W., the Rev. Samuel Barnett, Vicar of St. Jude's, Commercial-street, and other philantrophic gentlemen, the affair proved a complete *fiasco*. This is attributed by Mr. Barnett to "the failure of a large clothier, who was their chief customer." Your Lordships will see Mr. Barnett makes a note of this in the report. This failure is attributed by Mr. Barnett in his report to the failure of their chief customer.

8785. Where is it in his report?

It is right at the end, He says on the last page: "An experiment in this direction has indeed been tried by some of the men themselves, assisted by the Co-operative Aid Association. The enterprise at one time seemed likely to be successful, but broke down by reason of the failure of a large clothier who was the chief customer." Mr. Schloss, one of the promoters, however, candidly admits the cause of non-success to have been "principally, though, perhaps, not entirely, in consequence of the unwillingness of the workers to work with reasonable care and energy under a competent foreman, elected by themselves." I make the foregoing extract from his review of Mr. Burnett's report, published in the "Charity Organisation Review" for January. His views on the co-operative workshop idea, gained by practical experience, may prove of interest to your Lordships. If you will permit me I will just read it; it is the "Charity Organisation Review" for January 1888. He says, "Co-operation might be expected to produce great results in an industry in which the middleman occupies at present so important a position as in the slop-tailoring trade. It might be thought that by the adoption of co-operative methods money which would otherwise have been unfairly pocketed by the sweater might be secured for the workers, who would work under a foreman, and divide with him in

in just proportions the price obtained for the products of the labour of all. But we find that, in the very cases in which the pay of the workers is lowest, the profits of the sweater exceed the remuneration of his *employés* of equal capacity by a sum so small as to constitute merely the reasonable reward of his superintendence; while at the same time it is doubtful whether any mere foreman could be relied upon to manage successfully a workshop in which the *employés* were of the type found in the 'dens' of the majority of the sweaters. The lower the quality of work, the greater is the necessity for careful supervision and for a certain degree of despotism; it is only the highly skilled workman who can be implicitly trusted to do a fair day's work for a fair day's wages without requiring to be incessantly superintended, and not infrequently coerced. To borrow a remark quoted by Mr. Burnett (page 17) in relation to the establishment of Mr. Moses (who, as the reader will remember, is a large sweater doing a good class of business), it is the 'lack of a spirit of co-operation that makes the middleman necessary for the present in the fierce competition of his trade.'" I may further inform your Lordships that this want of co-operation among the work hands was in this instance very strikingly illustrated in the person of one of their number, who has made himself particularly notorious as an agitator against the present system. I allude to Lewis Lyons, a witness who has appeared before your Lordships' Committee. He occupied an official position in this co-operative business, the "Working Tailors' Association, Limited," and displayed his unselfish devotion to the interests of his comrades by absconding with the cash balance. I make this statement, with his full permission, on the authority of a gentleman of unimpeachable honour and position, namely, Mr. Schloss himself.

8786. Was there any prosecution instituted, or in what way do you know that?

I have a letter from Mr. Schloss himself, if you would like to see it (*producing a letter*).

8787. Lord *Sandhurst.*] Have you the authority of Mr. Schloss for producing it?

I have (*handing the letter to the Chairman*).

8788. Lord *Thring.*] Did Mr. Schloss authorise you to produce this letter in evidence?

I had a letter accompanying this, saying that I could produce this letter for any purpose I chose.

8789. *Chairman.*] Mr. Lyons has since paid back the greater part of it, if not all, has he not?

He has not paid his part back to Mr. Schloss.

8790. Will you proceed?

A great cry has been raised respecting the overcrowding of the market, alleged to be due to the influx of foreign paupers, it being stated that this is the cause of the fall in the prices paid for work. I have already pointed out that these "greeners" are not of much practical use in our trade, and that they are not employed by us to any appreciable extent. I will now show, to the best of my ability, the real cause of the fall in prices paid to the contractor by the wholesale houses. I may mention here that there is no fall in the wages paid by the contractors to the journeymen; on the contrary, there has been a decided tendency the other way. I should say that our hands are paid 25 per cent. better now than they were six or seven years ago. The fall in prices is due, in our trade as in others, to excessive competition. It is a matter within my own personal knowledge that low-class houses such as (I will not mention the name) and others I could name, a great many make it a practice to give work out to their hands at starvation prices, and if it is not accepted the hands get no more work. By this it may be inferred that the labour market is overcrowded. This, however, is a wrong way of putting the matter. If the trade was not to a large extent in the hands of these sweating firms there would be plenty of work at fair prices for all the tailors in London. Owing, however, to their cutting down policy, the old-established respectable firms are, in order to compete with them, compelled

to establish factories in the country, where cheap female labour can be obtained, to make a certain class of work in an inferior manner. I may here point out to your Lordships that in these factories in the provinces work is made for about half the price that we can make it in London for, and principally by English labour. Of course the garments produced by the better houses, made by the Jewish tailors in London, would cost to the purchaser 1 *s.* or 1 *s.* 6 *d.* more per suit than these country-made goods, or the inferior London made ones produced by the sweating houses. I contend, however, that this slight increase in the cost would really be a gain to the purchaser, because he would receive more than the extra value in durability and appearance. Furthermore, as a very large proportion of this low class trade is made for exportation, the reputation of English-made garments is lowered in the eyes of our colonies and our other buyers abroad. In confirmation of my contention as to the real cause of scarcity of work, I may point out to your Lordships' Committee that it only occurs during a certain season of the year. During the time when winter clothing is manufactured there is plenty of work for all the journeymen and masters in London, owing to the fact that these heavier garments require greater care, skill, and strength on the part of the workers who make them. For this reason the common female hands, both in London and the Provinces, are unable to successfully compete with the London Jewish tailors.

8791. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] What time of the year is it when the winter clothing is produced?

We should commence it about now; the end of July, and August, September, October, and November would be about the busy season of our year. I am glad to find, however, that I am in thorough agreement with the majority of the witnesses who have appeared before your Lordships' Committee in advocating the registration of all workshops and rooms used as such, additional factory inspectors, and a stricter enforcement of the Public Health Acts. I have advocated these reforms, both in the Press and on public platforms, for the past four or five years, and I believe I am supported in my views by the large majority of respectable master tailors. If these measures are thoroughly and energetically carried out, the black sheep who now disgrace the tailoring and other trades will be exposed, and the many will not suffer for the sins of the few. I do not wish to trouble your Lordships by contradicting the numerous absurd statements which have been made as to first-class hands merely earning a few shillings a week, and similar nonsense of that kind. I think the trustworthy evidence of Miss Potter, Mr. Lionel Alexander, and Mr. Stephany, on this point, are sufficient corroboration of my figures as to wages. I will only go into the evidence of a few of the more prominent witnesses. First I will take an assertion made by Lewis Lyons. He has affirmed that pressers in our trade have to lift irons weighing as much as 22 pounds, 36,000 times per day. I have been in the trade for 20 years and haver known a 22-pound iron to be used.

8792. *Chairman.*] Eighteen, 24, and 36 were the weights Mr. Lyons gave us; he said they had to lift it 36,000 times in a day of 15 or 16 hours for 2 *s.* 6 *d.*?

I have never seen an iron 24 pounds; I have seen 22 pound irons, but have never seen them in use; I have seen 22 pound irons in ironmongers' shops, but never seen them in a workshop, and I have been in a good many. From 14 pounds to 16 pounds is about the general weight. The statement as to 36,000 liftings is so absurd as to bear its own refutation. I will take a presser who works 14 hours in a day; I am speaking of actual work; 14 hours work is the outside limit.

8793. Do you mean there never has been a case where a man has worked more than 14 hours?

I should not say such a thing could not have been done.

8794. We have had evidence of 22 hours, even more; those are exceptional cases you would say?

This

This evidence has been given but no names, have been stated, and we have no means of finding out whether the allegations were correct.

8795. I only want to know whether you agree with the evidence to which I have referred?

I certainly do not. I will take the presser, who works 14 hours in a day, which I believe is the very outside limit. This means 50,400 seconds; and according to Lyons' statement he would have to lift the iron without cessation every second and a half, or 40 times a minute. I will just explain to your Lordships' Committee that a presser may use the iron on a coat for two or three minutes; it may take four or five minutes to get the coat in practical shape by his hands without using the iron. I should think a man working half an hour over a coat, pressing it, would be quite a quarter of an hour without having the iron in his hand at all.

8796. But I suppose when he lifts the iron he does not lift it once on to the coat and back again, there have to be two or three liftings in the course of the operation?

He would go over the garment with the iron in his hand, not lifting it, but smoothing the garment in that way (*describing.*)

8797. Would he not have to lift it off the fire on to the coat?

On to the table; there is a stand on the table.

8798. That is one lifting?

And then he would have to lift it occasionally as he requires to put it on the coat and take it off again.

8799. How long would he keep it off the fire?

It all depends how long it would keep hot; irons taken out hotter would keep longer; it averages about a quarter of an hour.

8800. Without putting it back you mean?

Yes. In reference to a statement made by the same witness that "a machine hand in a firm doing work for" (I will not mention names), a very respectable firm ——

8801. You may mention names that have been mentioned before?

Not this name. He stated that a machine hand in a firm doing work for "a very respectable firm" had to work 16 hours a day. I regret that the name and address of this alleged hand were not given. I could then have made inquiries as to the truth of the statement. In the absence of more definite particulars, I challenge Lewis Lyons to substantiate this assertion, as it is an established rule in the trade for men machiners not to work more than 13 hours; and I am perfectly certain that no machiner would work longer unless paid overtime. The reason I am so certain is that practical machiners are scarce in the market, and they are very independent; and a man would certainly not work 10 minutes overtime without being paid for it.

8802. That applies only to machiners, does it?

It applies to any other branch of the trade, to the practical men.

8803. Do you mean that it applies equally to pressers and under pressers?

Yes. I have told your Lordships' Committee that pressers in many instances work 14 hours, an hour longer than is the established rule in the trade, 13 hours for a man.

8804. Do I understand you to say that in all branches of the coat making trade the workers are so scarce that no man would consent to work overtime without being paid for it?

Yes.

8805. In all branches?

Yes; I am speaking of practical men, of course; the men that do not know their trade may put up with anything.

8806. But you confine your remarks, do you not, to the better class of contractors, such as yourself?
No, it would be general. I pointed out to the Committee that I do not do the best class of trade; I made that statement yesterday.

8807. Neither do you make the worst class?
No, I do not.

8808. Your business is confined to coat-making?
Coat-making only.

8809. Lord *Thring*.] Not trouser making?
No. What has principally been attacked by Lyons is the coat trade.

8810. Earl of *Limerick*.] You are not speaking of greeners now, but of trained hands?
Yes.

8811. Lord *Sandhurst*.] When you say 14 hours, does anything come out for dinner?
Yes. The machiners come in from seven to nine, or from six to eight in some instances, but the established rule is seven to nine, with an hour for dinner.

8812. Is that all which comes out; is there not half-an-hour about five o'clock?
No; they have their tea sent in, they have it in the workshop; because the Factory Act does not apply to male labour.

8813. *Chairman*.] Will you proceed with your statement?
Mr. Arnold White, whose chief point seems to be that the country is going to rack and ruin, and all Englishmen are going to starve owing to the immigration of foreigners, has shown you a vest alleged to be made for 4 *d.*, a coat made by a woman for 7½ *d.*, and a boy's knickerbocker suit for 4¾ *d.*, for which he said the middleman received 7 *d.* He also said that a suit for which the middleman received 1 *s.* 2 *d.* was only paid 10 *d.* for, and shirts at 1 *s* 6 *d.* were only paid 9 *d.* for. I do not see how this evidence supports his contention, but I am pleased that the instances of sweating which he has given do not reflect upon the foreign Jews whose presence here so disturbs his piece of mind, but upon enlightened independent English men and women. Doubtless we foreigners are all a very bad lot, but we have not yet sunk so low as to compete with English sweaters in making this wretched class of work at these starvation prices. We certainly have no burning desire to take this branch of the trade out of English hands. Englishmen have established it, and as far as we are concerned they are perfectly welcome to retain it. There are no Jews in the shirt or suit trade, and I only know of two in the vest trade; and the lowest price that they make waistcoats for is 10 *d.* With regard to Mr. Arnold White's evidence as to Government contract work, I can partially corroborate it. I am informed on good authority that Messrs. Webb, of Bethnal Green, and other firms of Government contractors, do sub-let a portion of their work. I have the name and address of a party (I am very sorry that I have not brought it here) who had work that was given to him from the firm, and he even has the book with the prices in it.

8814. Government work, do you mean?
Yes.

8815. You have not brought the name and address with you, you say?
No; but I am prepared to bring him forward.

8816. Do you know what class of Government work it was?
I do not.

8817. You had better furnish the Committee Clerk with the particulars?
I will. I am also informed by one of their late women hands that she was allowed to take work home to do after the factory hours, and that she was obliged

obliged to avail herself of this regulation to earn sufficient to keep herself. The next statement that I shall refer to is a statement of Solomon Plattman. He said that he is a first-class workman, and yet only able to earn 10*s.* or 12*s.* per week, a statement which is too ridiculous to contradict. If, as he said, he could make a better living in Paris (I believe he said that in his evidence), but was quite unable to earn sufficient to pay his passage back there, I am perfectly certain that the Jewish Board of Guardians would have assisted him to do so, as they have a special fund for that purpose and are only too pleased to relieve the burdens upon the English Jewish community by aiding their poorer co-religionists in this direction. In answer to Plattmann's statement that workmen are afraid to combine for fear of being discharged, I beg to bring under your Lordship's notice the fact that I personally, in conjunction with a number of other master tailors and journeymen, made a great endeavour to encourage and promote combination for the mutual benefit of both journeymen and masters. A meeting was called at the Jewish Working Men's Club on the 3rd of April 1886, for the object I have mentioned. Mr. Samuel Montagu, M.P., took the chair, and was supported by Mr. George Howell, M.P. The meeting was very numerously attended by journeymen. I have a copy of the resolutions passed at that meeting, but I cannot find it now.

8818. You can put those in later.

One of those resolutions was that a system be introduced to reduce the hours of labour. To the first resolution an amendment of want of confidence in the masters was moved by Lewis Lyons. When the mover of the original resolution endeavoured to gain a hearing, the journeymen present, at the instigation of Lyons, interrupted him in a most uproarious manner, and eventually, owing entirely to their action, the meeting was broken up in complete confusion. I merely point this out to your Lordships. One witness distinctly stated that if the masters were to know that the men wanted to combine, they would be discharged. I believe Mr. Plattman made that statement in his evidence.

8819. What was the result of that meeting?

It broke up.

8820. And nothing came of it?

Nothing came of it.

8821. And is there no society in existence now?

Yes; I will come to that. I think this fact alone conclusively proves that the masters have no desire to place any obstacle in the way of the men in the direction of combination. In fact, since 1886, we have removed all restrictions which the rules of our society may have contained, in order to facilitate union with the journeymen for the purpose of protecting the joint interests of both journeymen and masters, If your Lordships have no objection, perhaps you will look at this circular (*handing in a circular*). Being a sick benefit society, we thought that the subscriptions would be too high for the journeymen, and we have removed those weekly subscriptions to give all men engaged in the trade an opportunity of joining this association.

8822. Lord *Sandhurst.*] When did you make that alteration of letting the journeymen come in for nothing?

We did not let them in for nothing. We introduced a scheme of charging 2*d.* a week for trade purposes.

8823. When did you make that alteration?

The circular says that the next meeting will be held on the 27th June 1886, so that it was done previous to that. I cannot at the moment recollect the exact date. The witness, Mr. Madden, said on Tuesday last that it would require 99,000 tailors to manufacture for the population of London, supposing that one-fifth of the people wore tailor-made garments. I have been informed that, according to the log prices ("log prices" meaning the society prices; a log price is a price fixed by the aid of the society; it is called in the trade a "log") of the society Mr. Madden represents, those garments would cost about

25 *s.* or 30 *s.* per suit making; whereas the British workman can now buy a good durable suit for that sum, and I think under. It was also stated in evidence that the death rate among the members of the Amalgamated Society of Tailors was high. In contrast to that I beg to point out to your Lordships that in the societies of Jewish tailors I represent, consisting of both journeymen and masters, it is very low, in spite of the alleged bad sanitary arrangements and long hours of labour. We have only had three deaths within the last three years. I have a book from the society if any of your Lordships would like to inspect it, and I may say I have been in connection with this society for the last 12 years, and I can truthfully say that we have never lost one journeyman by death, although statements have been made the other day that a man could work no longer than 10 years, and that after that he has to go begging or to die. I can assure your Lordships, and I can bring you official corroboration, that we have not had one journeyman's death since I have been connected with this society, and that is for the last 12 or 13 years. Those three men that we have lost in the last three years were all of them master tailors; one man was between 70 and 80.

8824. *Chairman.*] How many members are there in your society?
About 230.

8825. Lord *Thring.*] What was the number of the society to begin with?
When we first started, we had a large number, then we went lower; but since we have introduced this rule and raised also our sick benefits (I may inform you that we pay 15 *s.* instead of 12 *s.*), we are at every meeting admitting six or eight members, and we meet once a month.

8826. Earl of *Limerick.*] Did you state how many were masters and how many wore journeymen?
About two-thirds journeymen and one-third masters; but I can inform the Clerk of the Committee of the exact numbers.

8827. *Chairman.*] Will you go on with your statement?
There is another witness who was here the other day; I think it was Mr. Zeitlin; he has made some very peculiar statements regarding the length of hours that girls work. He said that he saw girls go to work at six o'clock in the morning, and he did not suppose they had done till eight o'clock at night. He also said that he saw a button-holer making a coat in the same room with a child ill with small-pox. But as a rule those witnesses never gave names and addresses so as to enable you to see whether these things really exist, but in one instance the witness was asked by the noble Chairman (it was only last Tuesday) as to the name of a man that this Government contract work was sublet to; I believe that was the question the noble Chairman asked, whether he could give the name of the man who would sublet such work or receive such work.

8828. Yes; he said, "one was of the name of Gerson, in the East-end; the Coborn-road."
Yes, the Coborn-road. It is rather strange that the only name he gave was that of a gentleman I have been very well acquainted with, who left England some years ago and died abroad; he was an intimate friend of mine; he must have been dead five or six years; he left England then and died very shortly afterwards; I think about five years ago; I know he was in that line of business, Government contracting.

8829. Then the subsequent statement by Mr. Zeitlin, that it occurred last year, could not have been correct?
No; I believe your Lordships could easily ascertain, it being a Government contract, whose statement is true; mine or Mr. Zeitlin's. There is only one other witness whose evidence I wish to rebut, namely, that of Dr. Billing, the Bishop of Bedford. Of course, I should be very sorry to say anything which might be construed into an imputation upon the veracity of this gentleman, but I am bound to say that that evidence displayed a want of personal knowledge on this important point. He mentioned race-hatred, that the English hated the Jews, or the Jews the English, and that race-hatred was springing up in the East-end

East-end of London, or something of that kind. I can assure your Lordships that this evidence has taken greatly by surprise the English people in the East-end of London. I can assure your Lordships that I myself can personally testify in the most emphatic manner that the Jews and Christians in my own neighbourhood are on the very best terms, associate together in the same societies and clubs, and show every respect towards each other as friends and neighbours, without distinction of race or creed. He also said that we Jews would not employ English, and that the English would not employ Jews. All I can say upon that statement is this: that the reason we really prefer Jews is because they are more attentive and industrious in their work. When I was a young man about 20 or 21 years of age, I remember there were a great number of Irish and English tailors employed in our trade, for the very reason that in case our Sabbath should come in on a Friday afternoon early, we did not want to employ our hands on the Sabbath by keeping them an hour or two later; therefore we wanted one or two of these other men, so that if anything should be left over to finish these men could finish the work. But the result was that just the very day we wanted them to do the work they would ask for a shilling or two to go out and get something, and they would go out and never come back any more. This is an admitted fact throughout the East-end of London; or else we have no prejudice against Christians, but quite the contrary. I have two witnesses here, two Christian girls, who have worked nearly the whole of their time for Jews. Perhaps your Lordships may find it profitable to examine them upon this point, in addition to their labour experience.

8830. Is that all your statement?
That is all of my statement. I may state generally that I contradict Mr. Burnett's report regarding the quantity of button-holes that can be made in one hour. I said yesterday that I should bring to-day a button-holer who could button-hole a coat here, and your Lordships could test the time. She is here, and she could do the work in the meantime while I am giving evidence.

8831. I think we had better cross-examine you first. Mr. Arnold White defined a sweater as a man who gives neither capital, skill, nor speculation, and yet gets a profit?
Yes.

8832. I understand you to say that you have a considerable amount of capital invested in your business?
We have.

8833. And you work yourself?
Undoubtedly.

8834. And you call yourself a skilled workman?
Undoubtedly.

8835. In fact, if you were not a contractor yourself, would you be in a position to earn as high wages as the highest wages you pay any of your *employés*?
Certainly; undoubtedly.

8836. Now I want to ask you some questions about the wages that you pay. You told the Committee yesterday, in answer to Question 8648: "The following table I vouch for as an actual average of the wages payed to our *employés*: fitters and practical machiners earn from 7 *s.* 6 *d.* to 10 *s.* per day; pressers from 7 *s.* to 9 *s.* per day; under pressers from 4 *s.* to 7 *s.* per day; basters (men) from 5 *s.* to 8 *s.* per day; fellers (women hands) from 2 *s.* 6 *d.* to 4 *s.* 6 *d.* per day?"
Yes.

8837. Have you brought your wage-book with you?
I was going to make an explanation about this, previous to concluding my evidence to day. It may meet with surprise if I state to you that there is no such thing existing amongst ourselves as a wage-book, for the very reason that the work is in the hands principally of Jews, who as a rule are no scholars. I will explain how we pay our hands. We make a sheet out every Friday; that is

is as a rule destroyed; but I have been informed on good authority that some of your Lordships on the Committee have really visited some of our workshops, and I believe that the wages that I have stated are about accurate.

8838. You adhere to this statement I have just read to you as to the wages you pay in your own shop?
I state that those are the wages paid generally throughout the trade.

8839. But you say, "I vouch for them as an actual average of the wages paid to our *employés*?"
Speaking of the trade generally.

8840. Does it apply more particularly to your own business?
It applies to my own and to the trade generally.

8841. Look at this; is not this a return of the rates of wages paid to your workpeople that you made out yourself (*handing a return to the Witness*)?
Yes.

8842. Is there any machiner there who is paid as high as 10 *s.* a day?
No. I said that people in the trade are paid as high as 10 *s.* a day. I said that I myself do not work for the very best trade. Mr. Burnett got my fitters down at 8 *s.* per day in his report. I at that time said that higher wages than these are paid. I myself do not work for the best trade. When I referred to that statement which you have quoted, it applied to the trade generally.

8843. I will ask you a question or two about your own business, because, of course, you know it better than any other. Do you pay your general tailors 8 *s.* 6 *d.* a day?
Fitters, men, that would be.

8844. And your basters, the lowest 3 *s.* 6 *d.*, and the highest 6 *s.*
Yes. I will make another alteration there. There is a man that has worked for me some time; that man, who was in my employ at that time, has now left; I can forward the name and address of the party who worked for me, and he received 6 *s.* Now the man in his place gets 5 *s.* 6 *d.* I did not discharge the other, but I was rather quiet, and he left of his own accord. I am prepared to give the name and address of the party to the Clerk for inquiries to be made whether he did not receive 6 *s.* from me at the time this is dated.

8845. You pay your machinists the lowest 4 *s.*, and the highest 8 *s.*?
Yes.

8846. And your pressers from 4 *s.* to 8 *s.*?
Yes.

8847. And your button-hole workers earn from 3 *s.* 6 *d.* to 5. *s*?
Yes.

8848. Mr. Burnett says that they cannot earn 4 *s.* a day, and you say that your button-holers earn 5 *s.* a day?
Yes.

8849. How much do you take off that 5 *s.* for gimp and twist; how much would they use in the day?
A button-hole hand would, perhaps, answer that for herself; I do not purchase the gimp and twist; they find them.

8850. Lord *Clinton.*] Do they earn wages all the year round at that rate?
Yes.

8851. Your hands earn those wages all the year round?
Yes; but if we only work two or three days they are only paid for that two or three days.

8852. *Chairman.*] You have more or less constant employment for your hands all the year round?
I have had till lately, but the trade has been quiet for the last three or four months.

8853. Are

8853. Are you not exceptionally situated as compared with other manufacturers, in that you have an established connection, and get more work than most of them?
Not more than the most of them. I own that I do have a little more than others, but I am not one that gets the most.

8854. Would not most contractors in the trade say that they wished they had as much regular work as Mr. Moses has?
There may be some.

8855. At any rate the 5 *s.* a day for button-holers covers the cost of gimp and twist?
Yes.

8856. What apprentices do you employ?
Now I have three; two girls and a boy.

8857. And what do they earn?
The boy gets 7 *s*, 6 *d.* a week.

8858. And the girls?
One girl gets 5 *s.*, and the other girl 2 *s.*

8859. What are your hours of work?
We have two distinct hours, different for men and women.

8860. For men, what are they?
Men machiners work from 7 to 9; pressers from 7 to 10; females from 8 to 8; out of which they have an hour and a half for meals.

8861. What is the greatest number of coats that a woman can make in a day of 12 hours?
She would only work 10½ hours.

8862. That is 12 hours, less the meal time. What is the greatest number of coats that a woman can make; could she make four coats a day?
It all depends how many button-holes they have; some have four, some six, some eight, and some may have 20 button-holes; so that I can hardy answer the question.

8863. Who does your shopping for you?
Myself.

8864. Then you do not send any of your hands?
No, unless a special thing may be wanted immediately, and I could not leave; then I may get one of my boys, and send him up just to get a certain thing; but that would be very rare.

8865. Do you give any of your work out to be done by others, sub-contractors?
No, it is not done in the trade; I do not know any in the whole trade that I represent that does so

8866. Mr. Arnold White in his evidence, at No. 1320, said: "The first receiver of a garment is known as the labour contractor"?
Yes.

8867. "And the man who receives it from him, as the sweater." Therefore, taking that definition, as you are the first person to receive it, you would call yourself the labour contractor?
Yes.

8868. And not the sweater?
Undoubtedly not the sweater.

8869. And you say that the sweater, as there defined, does not exist in your trade?
No, he does not.

8870. Do you mean to say there is no case where labour is sub-contracted?
No case where work is given out as far as the coat trade is concerned. I have made this my special study since this report has been out; I myself, in conjunction with two or three others, have made it a point to make special inquiries into this, and we have visited an enormous amount of places, and have not come across one where the work is given out to be made.

8871. Now with regard to your extra time, do you say that you always pay overtime?
Unquestionably.

8872. How many hours would you call half-a-day overtime?
Machiners would work six-and-half hours for half a day, and seven hours the pressers.

8873. Supposing they work eight or nine hours' overtime, would that still be consider only half a day?
No, they would be paid overtime if it is only one hour.

8874. Do you do that in the case of all your *employés*?
In the case of all my *employés*.

8875. And you say that that is the general practice in the trade?
Undoubtedly.

8876. When we are told that 14 hours is considered a day, and seven and half, eight, or nine hours half a day, and four, five, or six hours a quarter of a day, you would say that that is not true?
I would certainly say it is not true.

8877. Have you any knowledge of cases in which men work all night, and are told in an indefinite manner that they will receive extra pay, and only receive 2*s.* 6*d.* or 3*s.*?
I do not believe it.

8878. You believe that evidence to be untrue?
Yes.

8879. Have you the Rules Abstract prescribed by the Factory Act?
Yes.

8880. Whereabouts in the room do you keep it?
Very prominent; framed under glass.

8881. You do not keep it put away in a drawer?
No, it is framed under glass.

8882. And do you think that your *employés* ever read it, or take the trouble to inquire what the regulations under it are?
I do not believe they do.

8883. Can many of them read English?
Some of them can.

8884. Only some of them?
Only some of them.

8885. The most part of the Jews would not be able to read it?
They would not.

8886. Therefore you think that it is rather an unnecessary precaution to hang these rules up?
I do. I think if they were to print them in the language they could read it might be of some use, but it is a known fact that they pretty well know the rules and regulations in the trade.

8887. Could you suggest any way in which the provisions of the Factory Act (which I understand you approve of) might be better made known to the workers?

The

The only suggestion I could make would be to have the rules printed in the different languages.

8888. And do you think that then they would take the trouble to read them?
They may not take the trouble then; some of them might.

8889. The men who work in your shop work on the system of sub-division of labour?
Yes.

8890. And could a coat maker make a pair of trousers, or a vest maker a juvenile suit?
As a rule not; some of them may be able to do so, but as a rule not.

8891. As a rule they only know their own branch of the trade?
They only know their own branch of the trade.

8892. Do you think that they know the prices paid for the coats by the employers?
I believe that they do, because as a rule the prices are marked on the labels in plain figures. I could forward to the Committee Clerk a label sent out from those firms with the price on (*the Witness produces a coat*). I have one here, but that does not appear to be a stock label; it is an order label (*handing it in*).

8893. The price on this is up in the corner, 3 *s.* 7 *d.*?
Yes; but on stock labels you will see it written on, "price so much making."

8894. "Wanted Monday, special"; what does that mean?
That the coat is wanted Monday.

8895. When would this be given out?
On Thursday night.

8896. How many hands do you employ altogether?
I made a little error yesterday; I said 38; it is 36.

8897. Lord *Clinton.*] How many of those are men?
Twenty men and 16 women.

8898. *Chairman.*] I think Mr. Burnett said that you employed between 40 and 50?
I do not know where he got those figures from. I have employed as many as 40.

8899. How many garments can 40 make in a day?
It all depends what sort of garments.

8900. Coats?
There are so many different coats.

8901. Would 80 coats be a fair average for a day's work?
Of certain coats they could do more than 80; there are certain coats of which perhaps they could not do more than 50.

8902. Mr. Lyons in his evidence told us that in a shop that employed 20 hands they would turn out about 40 garments, each paying 3 *s.* on an average. I ask you if you employ about double that number of hands, whether you could turn out 80 garments at 3 *s.*?
No, not 3 *s.* coats, because a coat at 3 *s.* would be an overcoat, and be a heavier coat.

8903. Earl of *Limerick.* What class of coat is this which you have just shown us?
This is an order coat; this is a jacket. We may get three or four a-day of this class.

8904. *Chairman.*] You do not believe that, as a rule, in the contractor's shops 40 garments at 3 *s.* a-day can be turned out by 20 hands?
No.

 8905. That

8905. That would be putting it too high?
Too high.

8906. Then we will take Mr. Lyon's figures for wages, and I will ask you whether you will agree with them, and if not how far you differ; he says that in a shop employing 20 hands, two machinists would be employed at 6 *s.*, and three plain machinists at 2 *s.*?
There is no such thing as a plain machiner in our trade at 2 *s.* Mr. Burnett has visited some of these workshops, as I know he had the assistance of the colleagues of Lewis Lyons, who no doubt, took him to the worst ones; and the lowest figure he puts down a plain machiner at is 3 *s.*

8907. Two pressers at 6 *s.*, and one under-presser at 1 *s.*; could you get such?
No, you could not.

8908. It is quite out of the question, you think?
Yes.

8909. A baster at 6 *s.*?
Oh, yes; that is right.

8910. And three girls at 1 *s.* 8 *d.*?
That would be an improver; it would not be a general hand; it would not be a hand that you could use for anything. You could get girls at 1 *s.* 8 *d.*, but not a general hand; you could use her only for one thing and for doing nothing else.

8911. I understand you to say that four button-holers ought to earn considerably more than 1 *s.* 8 *d.* a day. Mr. Lyons says in the shop he described four button-holers would be employed who could earn 6 *s.* 8 *d.* between them?
If one was an exceptionally quick one, she could earn that herself, I think.

8912. You say, in short, that he has made it four times too little?
I will say three times, not to go to an extreme; but three times is moderate.

8913. Then I should like to take you through his figures as to the outgoings. He estimates that the contractor could turn out 40 garments, paying 3 *s.*, and would have to spend 2 *s.* a day in trimmings, 2 *s.* 10½ *d.* in rent, 2 *s.* in fire and gas, and 4 *s.* in tea?
Does he mean that for a week or for a day?

8914. I will read you his evidence from No. 1781: "The trimmings generally average 2 *s.* per day; the rent of the rooms (I am talking about the workshop; some of the sweaters occupy four or five rooms themselves, but I cannot see why the workers should pay for what the sweater occupies for himself) runs (and this is a liberal calculation) to 2 *s.* 10½ *d.*; the fire and gas necessitate another 2 *s.*; while the barrow used for the conveyance of the work to the clothing establishment involves an outlay of 2 *d.* Not being a statist, I give the tea and coffee, without compunction, the value of 4 *d.*, and leave the sweater to chuckle over the three pennyworth extra of generosity with which he has been accredited. Reckoning all these items together, I bring the total expenditure to 2 *l.* 11 *s.* 0½ *d.*, and even then the sweater must give me credit for dealing with him in a very liberal manner. Subtracting this from the 6 *l.* earned on the 40 garments, I find the sweater pocketing at the end of each day the total profit of 3 *l.* 8 *s.* 11½ *d.*" What do you say to that?
He first of all puts down 40 coat trimmings at 3 *s.*

8915. What he says is this: "I give 3 *s.*, though I have said that in the majority of cases 7 *d.* and 1 *s.* are paid for garments, yet there are garments made for 5 *s.*, 10 *s.*, and 8 *s.*?
I think that is a very unfair average, 3 *s.*

8916. Do

8916. Do you agree, from your experience, that that which I have just now read to you is a fair estimate of the expenditure of the contractor?
No, I do not agree that it is a fair estimate by far.

8917. Would you say that the actual cost is twice as great?
For instance, shall I go over these separately, with your permission?

8918. Yes?
Am I right, that it is 2 *s.* for trimmings?

8919. Yes?
Mr. Burnett in his estimate puts down coat trimmings at a penny, and I am positive that a 3 *s.* coat cannot be made up with trimmings for one penny; and that for 40 coats would be 3 *s.* 4 *d.*; and I am sure that it is an impossibility to be done, because a coat that 3 *s.* would be paid for would have to be stitched with silk; 2 *d.* per coat would be a very moderate sum. If your Lordships will refer to the statements made by Mr. Burnett, that 1 *d.* per coat alludes to a 1 *s.* 2 *d.* coat; of course a 3 *s.* coat would require a better trimming. I reckon that for 40 3 *s.* coats the least the trimmings would come to would be about 6 *s.* or 7 *s.*

8920. Then with regard to the rent; will you go on now to the rent?
In the case of a man that would make 40 coats a day I should think his workshop would cost him about 6 *s.* a week.

8921. And fire and gas?
I should think it would cost him about 5 *s.* for gas.

8922. As against the 2 *s.* which Mr. Lyons said?
Yes; of course that may differ in summer or winter; but about 5 *s.* would be a fair sum to take.

8923. What would you say tea and coffee would cost?
For 20 hands I do not suppose you could do it under 9 *d.*; no, you could not do it for that, because it is twice a day.

8924. I only want to get your views, so that we may compare them with Mr Lyons's?
For 20 hands I should put it down at about 1 *s.* 6 *d.* a day, whereas Lyons said 4 *s.* for the week.

8925. Now I should like to take you to Miss Potter's statement of prices: she says, in answer to Question 3261, "The first-class, the bespoke work," which I understand is not your class?
No.

8926. A better class than yours?
Yes.

8927. "The bespoke work pays very good wages indeed; the machinists run from about 7 *s.* to 9 *s.* 6 *d.*, and the pressers run from about 5 *s.* to 8 *s.* 6 *d.*, and the women are rarely under 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a day;" now I understand that those prices are about the prices that you are paying?
Yes.

8928. Therefore you would say that your prices compare with Miss Potter's top prices?
I should employ the same people as Miss Potter said would be employed for that class of work. I believe Miss Potter was a little in error when she said the "first-class" trade. The work in the first-class trade would be made by hand; there would be no machinists there. She is alluding to the bespoke trade in the hands of the Jews.

8929. Then she says: "The second-class, the stock work, is also fairly paid; it is more regular than the bespoke work, but the pay is not quite so high.

The machinists run from 3 *s.* to 6 *s.*; pressers will run from 5 *s.* to 8 *s.*; and the women are as low as 1 *s.* 6 *d.*" Would that compare with your wages?

No, it would not; I have no women as low as 1 *s.* 6 *d.*

8930. Then again, in what Miss Potter calls the "second-class" trade, she says, "This shop makes coats for the best export trade," which would be, I suppose, about your class of work?

Yes.

8931. "At from 2 *s.* to 6 *s.* each; average, 3 *s.* 6 *d.* The manager is paid 3 *l.* a week; baster 7 *s.*; presser off 8 *s.*; under presser 7 *s.*; machinist, one man at 9 *s.*, three men at 8 *s.*, one woman at 4 *s.* 4 *d.*; general hands, four women, at 18 *s.* a week." Is that about your rate of wages?

That is a little over mine; mine are not quite so high as that.

8932. Then she says: "The last shop is a small slop shop, and this is one I worked at. The man himself does all the basting, fixing, and pressing, and works tremendously long hours. His coats range from 1 *s.* 2 *d.*, or 1 *s.* to 2 *s.* He has two machinists, 6 *s.* and 3 *s.* respectively; general hand, a woman, 1 *s.* 6 *d.*; a girl 2 *s.* a week, and lodging and food." That is the lowest class; that I suppose is more nearly what Mr. Burnett was pointing at in his report, is he not?

I can hardly follow her there. I do not think, I know, in fact, I have never come across a machiner that would work as low as 6 *s.* a day.

8933. Or 3 *s.*; Miss Potter says one at 3 *s.*?

That may be a plain machiner; I would say yes to the 3 *s.*, but not to the 6 *s.*

8934. We may take it that your shop is what may be described by both Mr. Burnett, Miss Potter, and Mr. Alexander as the highest of the second-class contractors' shops?

I can hardly call it the highest; I should not call it the highest.

8935. You say that there are men who pay higher wages than you do?

There may be some, yes; perhaps not in the second class trade; I would not be so positive on that.

8936. We may take it in this way; that all the statements you have made as to wages and hours, &c., only apply to the better class of work, and not to the lowest class?

No, I do not agree with that regarding the hours; I do not believe that machiners work in any shop longer than from seven to nine.

8937. Then you say that so far as all the statements that have been made of the extremely long hours and extremely low wages are concerned, you are prepared to contradict those statements by your own experience, and that your experience is one which may be taken as a criterion of the whole of the trade, high and low?

I do.

8938. Now you have a large workshop, I understand?

Yes.

8939. And how are your sewing machines placed with regard to the light; is there a good light upon them, or a bad light?

A good light. We have a skylight all over.

8940. And is that a common thing in the tailors' shops in the East-end?

Yes.

8941. Do you know of any cases in which they are so much in the dark that the machinist finds a great difficulty in seeing the work, and consequently hurts his hands and fingers?

I do not believe that, because it would be to the disadvantage of the employer to give the machiner a bad light; he would not go on with his work so well.

8942. Then

8942. Then you believe that the statements made to the Committee as to the practice of putting the sewing machines in a bad light are exaggerated?
I do really.

8943. Have you any personal knowledge yourself of having in your own shop taken any contract for Government clothing?
I have never received any.

8944. Is it your practice to impose fines on your workpeople?
No.

8945. None whatever?
None whatever.

8946. What happens if a girl comes late to the shop?
If she comes late I may send her home.

8947. She loses her day's work in that case?
No. Supposing she was to come in at a quarter past eight once or twice I might not take any notice; if she commenced making it a practice, I should send her home, and tell her to come at nine, and of course not pay her for the hour.

8948. Your practice is to deduct the lost time from the wages?
Yes.

8949. That is in the nature of a fine, is it not?
If they do not work during the time, then they are not paid. If the hours are from eight to eight, I believe it is their duty to be there at eight.

8950. Do you keep a book known as No. 40?
Yes, the overtime book.

8951. More than one?
Oh, no.

8952. Do you believe that it is a common practice in the trade to keep more than one?
I could not say.

8953. You know that evidence has been given before this Committee that the Factory Acts are habitually evaded by keeping a false book, No. 40, to produce to the inspector?
That is a question I can only answer as far as I personally am concerned; I cannot speak for others.

8954. When do you pay your wages?
Friday.

8955. Never pay them later than Friday?
Never.

8956. Do you know whether any others in your trade pay them later than Friday?
I do know some that pay them Saturday evening.

8957. Saturday evening, or sometimes on Sunday?
I do not know of any cases of that myself.

8958. Your hands are mostly Jews, are they not?
Yes.

8959. Can you tell the difference between a coat made by your Jew *employés* and one made by English mechanics?
Yes.

8960. It is well known in the trade, is it not?
It is handwork in the latter case, and you see there would not be the machine work about it, because our coats would be machine-stitched, and the other would be hand-stitched.

8961. Mr. Burnett, in his report, says (on page 1), "The mass of those employed under the sweating system labour in workshops where much fewer than 20 are engaged, or in the houses, which may be single rooms, of the 'small sweaters;'" neither of those cases applies to you?
No.

8962. Yours is one in which more than 20 are engaged, and in a room which is not in any way used as a dwelling?
No; it is built away from the house.

8963. Now I want to ask you some questions about the practices of the cutters. I understand you to say that the cutters give out work on behalf of the employers, and that they put down the prices on their own account, without the knowledge of their employers; is that so?
I did not say that.

8964. Will you explain what you did say with regard to the cutters?
I said that work is sent out in the evening which was wanted on the very same day in the morning, and thereby these goods must have been ordered previously, and not cut by the cutter, and when, on account of this, these goods come in late, and it comes to the knowledge of the head of the firm, and the customer refuses such an order, it is put on the stock, and the stock price only paid to the tailor.

8965. In many instances would you say that if 2 *s.* or 3 *s.* is lost on the garment that is the fault of the cutter?
Undoubtedly.

8966. Have you no power over the cutter; no power of appealing to the employer?
The cutter being virtually the tailor's master, his mouth is closed. He cuts the work and gives it out to the tailor, and takes it in, and if the tailor found fault with the cutter he would be discharged,

8967. You say that you are completely in the power of the cutter?
Yes.

8968. And if you made any complaint he would employ some one else?
Yes. This does not imply my own personal case, you must bear in mind; I mentioned that the way I am treated is in a different manner; but I am prepared, as I stated to the Committee yesterday, to bring witnesses before you who will corroborate these statements; in fact it is the general practice; whoever is employed in the bespoke trade in the East-end of London knows it.

8969. Lord *Clinton.*] Then you do not get the cloth from the employer and cut it out yourself?
It is cut on the premises of the employer.

8970. I thought you said you did the whole thing from the beginning?
It is cut on the premises of the employer.

8971. *Chairman.*] How long have you been engaged in the trade?
Since I was about 12½ year old.

8972. Can you say whether the coat trade, as we have been told is the case, has been brought in, practically, by the Jews; whether the coat trade under the conditions under which it exists now, did not exist 20 years ago?
Not to the extent it does now by any means.

8973. And since the great growth of it, has it been at any time in the hands of the Christians?
No, our trade has never been in the hands of the Christians.

8974. Therefore, if it was stated that the Jews have driven the Christians out of this particular branch of the tailoring trade, it would not be true?
Undoubtedly it would not. The truth of my statement could easily be ascertained by asking these warehouse and shopkeepers whether they ever employed English tailors to make that class of trade.

8975. I should

8975. I should like to know how much of the work you do yourself in your own trade; do you work as a presser?
No.

8976. In what way?
I superintend.

8977. You walk about the shop and see the others at work, you mean?
No; I examine every garment previous to my taking it into shop; I have to examine it closely.

8978. Then you do not do any of the pressing?
No.

8979. Nor any of the manual labour?
I think that examining the coats and lifting them and looking them round is manual labour. I think you would find it very hard work to stand for a whole day, as I have to do, harder at work than my men.

8980. You say, as I understand you, that you use your brains more than your hands?
At the same time, as we use our hands we have to use our brains.

8981. In what way have you to use your hands, beyond taking the coat up and turning it round and examining it?
If you have to lift 30 or 40, or 100 coats, it may be, some days, and throw them down, and see if buttons are put on right, and lay them smooth, and tie them up previous to sending them in to the shop, that is very hard work.

8982. But, as regards the different sub-divisions of the trade, machiners, pressers, basters, and so on, you take no part in any of that work?
No.

8983. Several of the witnesses before the Committee have suggested that the places where work is carried on under contractors should be registered; what do you say to that?
I should be in favour of that.

8984. You see no objection to it?
None at all.

8985. It has also been suggested, firstly, that the onus of registration should lie upon the contractor, and other witnesses have suggested that it should lie upon the employer; which of the two would you prefer?
I should suggest that the contractor should register his own workshop, and, by paying a very small fee, get a certificate; and that no employer should employ a man unless he has a certificate of registration.

8986. What would the certificate state?
That the workshop had been registered.

8987. Not that it was in a sanitary condition, or that it fulfilled certain requirements?
That could be; I am simply speaking of the registration.

8988. But your certificate would merely be that it has been registered?
Yes; and then that would be notice at any moment for the Inspector of Health and the Inspector under the Workshops Act to inspect the premises.

8989. And you would make it illegal for any employer to put his work out to be made in a place that was not registered?
Unquestionably.

8990. How could he always tell whether the person taking the work was going to take it to a registered place?
A man on applying for work would have to give his name and address, and on being questioned about it, he would have to produce his registration paper.

8991. He would be the custodian of the registration paper?
Yes; I should certainly say that at the time he registered his workshop he should

should receive a certificate of registration; it should be in his possession. I was here the other day when evidence was given by two other witnesses, Mr. M'Leod and another gentleman, and they seemed to differ about how this could be got over, and that it would be sufficient for the employer to say, "I have engaged so-and-so, and he said his workshop was registered." I do not think that would be sufficient. I contend it would be a very easy way for a man, by registering his workshop, to get a registration paper, which would be a very minor matter; and no one could get over that.

8992. Would it not be equally efficacious if the employer was to keep upon his premises a register a table, showing the workshops to which he sent work, so as to enable the factory inspector to have access?
Yes, that would answer the purpose.

8993. It would throw all the responsibility then upon the employer and not upon the contractor, would it not?
I will tell your Lordships the reason I suggest my way, because a man applying for work would know that he could not get employment unless his workshop was registered, and therefore he himself would strive to register his workshop.

8994. Have you ever thought of where the registration should be effected?
I should suggest in the district where he resides.

8995. At what office?
At the post office, for instance, as easiest of access, or even at the local authorities, the local office.

8996. And that a sufficient fee should be charged to cover the cost of the working of the registration?
I should say a very moderate fee.

8997. Sufficient to cover the expense?
It would not be very expensive.

8998. Do you think it would press hardly upon the smaller class of contractors?
Therefore I say it should be a very small fee.

8999. Why is it, do you say, that the work can be done cheaper in the provinces than in London?
I suppose they can live cheaper; rent is cheaper, and it is all female labour.

9000. And do you think that female labour is paid less highly in the provinces than it is in the East-end of London?
Unquestionably, by half.

9001. Lord *Clinton.*] That is in your branch of the trade?
Yes.

9002. But you do not speak of the lowest class of the trade, either in London or in the provinces, do you?
Even in the lowest class of the trade the cost is less in the provinces. I must make a little exception; I am not alluding to provincial towns, such as Manchester or Liverpool; I am speaking of provincial towns where factories are established.

9003. *Chairman.*] Such as Leeds and Stroud?
Yes, and Colchester; such places.

9004. Would you just tell the Committee what are the materials which your workpeople have to find themselves?
None, except twist and gimp for the making of the buttonholes.

9005. Those are the only materials?
Yes.

9006. Has

9006. Has your workshop been frequently inspected by the factory inspector?
Yes, very frequently.

9007. With regard to the sanitation of workshops, have you any reason to object to an extension of the powers of the factory inspector over the surroundings of your workshop?
I should have none.

9008. Do you think that that feeling would be shared by your fellow contractors?
Yes.

9009. We have been told by Miss Potter that the sanitation of the workshops in the coat trade is worse than in the trousers and vest trade; do you agree with that?
I do not.

9010. You think that it is quite as good?
Unquestionably so. If I remember rightly, Miss Potter said that those she visited were not the best of shops; I think, perhaps, she must have chosen one or two that she thought were the very worst. There may be exceptions.

9011. Do you think that the Jewish contractors, such as yourself, are getting more work than they used to a few years ago; is the work gradually getting into their hands?
It always has been in their hands. I think I am a little out there. If I remember rightly, about eight or nine years ago there were five or six men in the trade that did sub-let this work; but now it is entirely done away with; now they have it direct from the manufacturer.

9012. Will you tell us what you mean by the hands being better paid now than they were six or seven years ago; do you mean that the rate of wages is higher?
Unquestionably so.

9013. Take the lowest class of wage, which I think you said was 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a day, do you say that that is an improvement upon six or seven years ago?
Yes.

9014. What would the lowest wage have been six or seven years ago?
I should say that a young girl that gets 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a day now you would have got at that time very easily for 1 *s.* 8 *d.* a day.

9015. Now taking your highest paid wage, the general tailor at 8 *s.* 6 *d.* a day, what sort of wage could you have got such a man for six or seven years ago?
Six and sixpence or 7 *s.* at the very utmost.

9016. And could you have got a good machinest for the same price?
Yes, you could have got a good machinest for 7 *s.*

9017. And for your lowest class of machinest, a plain machinest, would you have had to pay as much as 4 *s.*?
No.

9018. You could have got her for less than that?
Yes.

9019. What could you have got a button-holer for?
That was paid at the same rate as now.

9020. There has been no change in the payment for button-holes?
No change as to the button-holes.

9021. It depends upon the skill of the worker entirely what she earns there?
Yes; it is piece-work.

 9022. Now,

9022. Now, with regard to your society, I do not think you have handed us in any copy of the rules of your society?

No, I have omitted them, but I should be most pleased to forward a copy to the Committee Clerk.

9023. Is the principal object of your society to combat the prices of the employer, or those of the contractor?

Of the employer.

9024. So that the contractor and the workmen are at one in that matter?

At one. We look at it in this light. If at any time we should try to better our position with our employers the workers may be taken on by the employers, or start work of their own, and we should be locked out.

9025. When you say "if at any time," does that mean you never have made a stand?

No, not as far as my recollection goes.

9026. Why have you never made a stand?

Simply because we could not get the members to combine for it.

9027. Do you mean as in the case of the journeymen of whom we have heard who all meet together one night agree that they will not accept less than a certain standard the next morning one of them breaks through the agreement?

We have never met together at all. We have tried, as that circular points out, at that meeting to combine with the trade, and then to consider what steps to take to improve the position.

9028. We have been told that the reason was that the men were uneducated, and that many of them had a great difficulty in speaking the English language; but I take it that where they can be led by their masters, the contractors, those difficulties ought to be overcome; why are they not?

Because it is like every other class; they have a certain amount of agitation; the people that lead this agitation get a living by it, and live upon nothing else; they do not do a day's work, and if it should come to any arrangement, the agitation would cease, and their employment would cease, men like the very person I spoke of before. He could have 7 *s.* or 8 *s.* a day; I will challenge him to contradict me whether he could not have it working from seven to nine, but he will not do a day's work.

9029. You said that no journeyman in your society had died during the 12 years that it had been in existence?

No.

9030. Then I gather that you deduce from that they are men in fairly good health?

Fairly good health.

9031. Does it not strike you as rather a peculiar circumstance that out of 230 men none have died in 12 years?

I was only making that observation myself when I tried to get the information.

9032. If such was said of any 230 men you might meet in the street, you would say that it was a remarkable thing?

Yes. They are not all journeymen, the 230, you must remember; two-thirds of them would be journeymen.

9033. You said that the Jews and the Christians worked together in perfect harmony. I do not think that the Committee have been led to believe by any witnesses that it was otherwise, except, perhaps, Dr. Billing; but Mr. Arnold White, I think, stated that there was growing up in the East-end of London a very bitter feeling against the Jewish immigrants?

Yes; when we have men like Mr. Arnold White trying to sow the seed of discontent, that must arise as a natural consequence.

9034. Is

9034. Is there, or is there not, a feeling among the Christians that they would like to do something to prevent this competition of Jewish labour with them?
I have never come across any.

9035. You believe that the Christian workmen in the East-end are perfectly content to submit to the Jewish competition?
I will not say that they are perfectly content; but I have never come across any case where there was hatred, as Dr. Billing says.

9036. You have never come across that feeling prevalent in other countries, which is known by the name of Judenhetze?
No.

9037. I think you said that your principal reason for preferring the Jewish labourers to the Christian labourers was that they were less particular, and more ready to abide by the regulations you prescribed for them?
I beg pardon; I made no such statement.

9038. What is your reason?
I said they are more skilled and industrious and attentive to their work.

9039. Did I not understand you to say that whereas the Christians were independent and liked to go away for half-a-day's holiday, and so forth, the Jews were always willing to abide by the regulations?
No, my contention was this: that when we did employ non-Jewish workmen they did not go out for a holiday, but took a shilling or two, or met one of their friends perhaps, and stay away for a day or half-a-day.

9040. Lord *Sandhurst.*] You say Mr. Arnold White has attempted to sow dissension between the Jews and the Christians?
It led me to believe so, by his making the statement that he did.

9041. That is your individual opinion, you mean?
Yes, certainly.

9042. You are a very good master, no doubt, and do a very good class of work; but I suppose you must admit that there is an enormous amount of misery that goes on in the lowest class of *employés* generally?
When you say an enormous amount I do not agree.

9043. Then it is distinctly your opinion that the case has been very much overstated?
It is.

9044. But are you well acquainted with the very poorest class of *employés.*
I am acquainted with a great many of them.

9045. You said just now that the work was much more cheaply done in the country than in London?
Yes.

9046. But is it not the fact that some time ago the men went out on strike at Leeds?
Yes, I made a statement myself about that yesterday.

9047. And was not the work taken up in London?
That statement has been circulated about; I have tried to make inquiries but I have not come across any firm where work has been received from Leeds. I believe there are higher wages paid in London than what there are in Leeds.

9048. Therefore you believe that that report is unfounded?
I do; I could not speak for certain; I have made every endeavour to trace it that I possibly could.

9049. Now in regard to these inspectors; it has been suggested to us that there should be a certain class of inspectors who should have technical knowledge; have you got any opinion to give on that subject?

I am afraid of this, that if a man were to be employed from the ranks of the workers he would use arbitrary power; that is the only objection I should have.

9050. Therefore you think that life would be more intolerable from an excess of supervision?
Not from an excess of supervision.

9051. I will put my question differently; you think that life would be more intolerable because of the annoyance of the continual running in and out of these inspectors than under the circumstances which at present exist?
Yes. I should be strongly in favour of a larger staff of inspectors unquestionably so; but as far as I am personally conceaned, I should not like to see them appointed from the ranks of the workers.

9052. Would you like to see a higher class of inspectors than such persons?
Yes, I should; then we should be treated as gentlemen; I am positive we should not by others. I have been amongst them for years, and I know the class of people; they are not as submissive a race as Mr. Burnett leads you to believe.

9053. Lord *Clinton.*] There is a considerable amount of subdivision of labour in your branch of the trade, is there not?
Yes.

9054. Is that of recent introduction?
No.

9055. That always has been so, as far as you know?
Yes.

9056. That has been complained of in the interests of the work people; what is the advantage of it to the workpeople?
The advantage to the workpeople is that a person can get a quicker knowledge of one branch of the trade, and get perfect sooner at one branch, and be able to earn a living sooner, than if he had to know the whole trade.

9057. Then he must always continue in that particular branch of the trade?
Yes.

9058. Supposing a man wanted to set up for himself, I suppose it is less easy for him under that system of subdivision than it would have been when he learnt several branches?
There is many a man who sets up manufacturing who takes contracts out who knows the trade thoroughly, and some of them only a certain branch; but by being in the trade some years they gradually pick up other branches of the trade; a man who has any tact about him picks it up gradually. I have had a man working for me who came in as a machiner, and when a certain party left who may have had a responsible position, I have put this man to the other party's place though it was a trade he was never brought up to.

9059. You think a man is practically better off by knowing well a particular branch of the trade when setting up for himself, rather than by knowing several branches of the trade not so well?
Unquestionably.

9060. As to the wages, you pay by the day, do you not?
Yes.

9061. Then of course you can only pay the men when they are at work?
Yes.

9062. Do your men lose much time?
Till within this last four or five months we have been pretty fairly employed, but

but this winter trade has been exceptionally quiet, and I have been quiet for three or four months.

9063. Can you tell the Committee the average wage earned by your people during the year?
There are so many different wages I could not say. Taking the whole year round I should say that my people on an average would work four days in a week.

9064. Taking the whole year through?
Yes, the Jewish holidays and all.

9065. Have your workpeople, men and women, worked for you for years?
Yes.

9066. You do not change often?
No.

9067. I forget if you said you apprentice boys?
I have one boy and two girls.

9068. It is not your practice to apprentice boys?
No.

9069. And that is not the practice generally now in the trade, is it, to apprentice boys?
Yes.

9070. Why do you not apprentice boys?
I do not want any; I have no room for them. My space is limited, and if I took too many boys in it takes up a man's room.

9071. You have none of what they call improvers?
No.

9072. You do not employ them?
Occasionally.

9073. But as a rule they are adults only?
Yes.

9074. Earl of *Limerick.*] You have no personal experience, I understand, of what has been called the "greener" in the boot trade; what is the name in the tailoring trade; an improver?
No; I should not call a greener an improver. I should call a young girl or boy who has been for a certain time in a certain place and may have worked there for six or eight months, or 12 months, and then gone to another shop, I call them improvers.

9075. Do the foreign Jews just landed come into the tailoring trade much, in your experience?
No, not much.

9076. By what name would you designate in the trade men while they were learning?
They would be learners.

9077. Is there any technical name, I mean, for them?
No.

9078. Not like "greener" in the boot trade?
I do not know whether they do not call them "greeners," the same in our trade.

9079. But you know nothing about that in your class of trade; as far as you know, it has not been affected by that influx of foreign immigrants?
No.

9080. *Chairman.*] You do not deny that newly-landed Jewish immigrants are employed in the tailoring trade, do you?

Not to a large extent. They are employed in our trade, but to a very small extent.

9081. Earl of *Limerick.*] You do not think that their employment has depressed the wages?
I do not. My previous answer proves that, when I said that wages have risen among the workers.

9082. I think your previous answer did not quite go to the extent that the wages of the lower classes had been improved; only the wages of the better classes?
In the trade generally.

9083. Down to the lowest classes?
Yes; the trade generally has been improved as far as the trade is in the hands of the foreigners; of course I cannot speak of other trade.

9084. About the coats; I think you said that you could not estimate how many coats would be made by a workshop of 20 workpeople in a day, because coats differ?
Yes.

9085. But what are known as the 3 *s.* coats are alike, are they not?
No; there is no regular fixed price for a certain garment.

9086. I am anxious to get, if possible, your estimate of the number that could be produced, but as there is no one general starting point to go from, I suppose we cannot arrive at that?
No; Lewis Lyons gave it in such a way that we could not get at it. That was his object.

9087. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] You have said that when it has been attempted to carry on the work in large workshops established by the wholesale firm in London they did not succeed?
Yes.

9088. Is that the case in the country towns too?
No

9089. You think there they succeed?
Yes.

9090. And you have mentioned an instance of co-operation attempted which was a failure?
Yes.

9091. Is that the only instance of co-operation that you know of?
That is the only instance.

9092. The only instance tried in your trade?
Yes.

9093. Do you think that would prove that co-operation would alway fail. There were peculiar circumstances there; there was the question of the manager, and it was a first experiment?
Yes. I do think it would fail for that reason; that a man like myself would be wanted; or I should perhaps leave myself out and say that the contractor as he is now would have to be displaced and a manager appointed as a foreman. He would have to receive his salary, and he would not work as hard as we do, and not have as direct an interest in the production and the quality of the goods as we have.

9094. Then do you consider that Mr. Lyons gave an entirely deceptive picture of the life and work of your employés?
Yes.

9095. Do you not think he gave a true picture of some kinds of sweating among people of a lower order?
No, I do not.

9096. Do

9096. Do not you think there is anything so low?
No.

9097. And no family so poor?
No, not so low and miserable as he put it.

9098. That there are no such low wages at all?
No.

9099. You mentioned among the remedies, the increase of factory inspectors, and as I understood you, you would be afraid of a certain annoyance; is that from all kinds of inspectors?
No, from the lowest kinds. I said if they were appointed from the higher ranks we should be treated as gentlemen.

9100. And in any case no inspector would annoy the highest class of shops; there would be no annoyance possible to them?
What I meant is that I am in favour of an additional number of inspectors, but I should prefer them to be appointed from the higher ranks.

9101. You have no reason to think there is any kind of annoyance likely to arise with inspectors from the higher ranks?
Not at all, because we are treated as gentlemen; as long as we carry out the laws to their satisfaction we are treated as such.

9102. You mentioned as remedies the registering of workshops, and more factory inspectors, and the enforcing of the Public Health Act?
Yes.

9103. Is there much drinking among workpeople of the class that you employ?
No.

9104. Not days given entirely to drinking?
No; there is a great deal of smoking amongst our class of people.

9105. Not drinking and losing time?
No, they may in exceptional cases.

9106. Would there often be greeners employed in the same shop with those practical machiners and practical pressers that you spoke of as very independent men; would there be greeners working in the same shops.
Yes.

9107. The same hours?
Yes.

9108. Not longer?
No.

9109. Not longer than the 13 or 14 hours?
No; if they are only over here for one week, they get led by the other class not to work longer.

9110. And they do not work longer?
They do not.

9111. When you said that they have one hour for their dinner, do they take their dinner in the shop or go home?
Not in the shop; they go home.

9112. I think you said that although they could not read English, and the rules were not printed in other languages, yet there was a general knowledge prevalent amongst them of the rules?
Oh, yes.

9113. It would not be easy to depart from the rules without their knowledge?
No.

9114. You said that men worked upon the average about four days a week all the year through?
I only spoke as far as I am personally concerned; about four days a week is a very fair average, I think, taking the holidays into account.

9115. As a fitter or a practical machiner earns from 7 *s.* 6 *d.* to 10 *s.* a day, is it your opinion that you might say that a fitter or a practical machiner practically got from 30 *s.* to 40 *s.* a week all the year round?
Yes, these practical men.

9116. Would pressers get from 28 *s.* to 30 *s.* all the year round, working four days a week?
Yes.

9117. And underpressers from 16 *s.* to 28 *s.*?
Yes.

9118. Would button-hole makers get 15 *s.* a week all the year round?
Yes.

9119. It is not an occasional 3 *s.* 9 *d.* a day, and then a week or a fortnight without?
No.

9120. But they always work four days a week?
Yes, their work keeps pace; if you have a certain staff you have to have a complete staff and have to have the button-holers keep pace. We do not discharge our hands when the trade is quiet, and give work, perhaps, to 20 and leave the other 20 to be idle; that is not a common occurrence; I do not know of any, if it occurs at all; we employ the whole staff and divide what labour there is.

9121. We have heard of a number of workmen in the slack time coming and sitting all day and almost all night in the shops waiting for work when there was none?
If your Grace will allow me, I think that refers to the large City shops, not to us.

9122. *Chairman.*] What do you call City houses; the West-end?
Those who manufacture on the premises. For instance, the Civil Service Stores were given as one example.

9123. But they are in the West-end?
Yes.

9124. By "City," therefore, you mean West-end?
City and West-end.

9125. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] But we heard of sweaters keeping men on ready for anything that might come in, and having the men to sit there all day long with their hands before them waiting till work came?
When we have no work for them we do not want them in the house. What should we want them in the house for, because if we get work late in the afternoon we should not start it till the next morning?

9126. You let the men know when they will be required?
They are generally called in the evening if there will be work in the morning.

9127. You do not believe in men sitting all day long waiting for work?
No, I do not.

9128. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] How long do your apprentices stay with you, one year or two; you take a boy, he begins as an apprentice, and how long would he remain at such before he gets wages?
We give him wages on the start.

9129. How long is it until he gets full wages, I mean?

I can

I can hardly say about full wages, because a boy may be apprenticed for two years, and would not be a practical machiner then.

9130. But he would cease to be an apprentice?
Yes.

9131. In two years he would be able to earn what?
Five shillings a day at the very least.

9132. Lord *Monkswell.*] You said, I think, that the cutting down policy of the sweaters induces the better houses to lower wages by the employment of women in the country in factories where work can be done for half the wages paid in London; yet you say that there is plenty of work for all. If there is plenty of work, how is it that men and women will take starvation prices?
When I said work for all, I was meaning for the Jews that are engaged in the trade. It has been said that there are so many engaged in the trade that the warehouses take advantage of that, and cut down the prices.

9133. Then you are only speaking of Jews?
Yes.

9134. Then there are persons, I suppose, so unskilled (I do not say among the Jews) that no tailors will employ them?
I do not say among the Jews; there may be some that would not be employed.

9135. Is there not always a glut of the most unskilled labour; cannot you always get a great many more than you want of that class?
Unskilled, yes.

9136. Then your remark did not apply to the most unskilled labour; there would always be a glut of that?
We should always be able to get unskilled labour.

9137. There would be always more than is wanted, in fact, seeking for employment?
Perhaps there would be; but what I point out is this: they remain so short a time as unskilled, they pick the trade up so soon, and become skilled in so short a space of time.

9138. I suppose there are some that remain unskilled?
Very few and far between.

9139. *Chairman.*] You mean that the trade is so easily learnt that if a man has been three months in your shop he would come under the definition of skilled labour?
No.

9140. Will you explain what you do mean?
A man would have to be a twelvemonth in the trade, and some of them would have to be longer; it all depends upon what branch of the trade a man may have to take; some men pick up one branch of the trade quicker than another.

9141. Lord *Monkswell.*] The difficulty would be to begin, would it not?
I suppose he would have his friends to advise him what to begin at.

9142. Does not the sub-division of labour add to the demand for the most skilled work in this way: that it enables you to separate the skilled from the unskilled labour; there must be certain operations that the most unskilled labour can perform?
Yes, but we can only perform those in proportion to the skilled.

9143. Still that would enable you to employ more unskilled labour on fairly good tailoring than if there was not that sub-division?
Yes.

9144. As to your journeymen, you say that you have had no deaths for 12 years

years among 150, say; you said two-thirds of your total number were journeymen?
Yes.

9145. Do you not sometimes lose sight of your journeymen?
Very few have been erased; when they suspend their subscription we erase them from the books.

9146. I suppose they are mostly young men?
No, we do not keep any under 21.

9147. And how long do you take them?
From 21 to 45.

9148. Do you know of no case of large workshops attached to a shop succeeding?
Oh, yes.

9149. You mean that, as a general rule, they do not succeed?
Yes.

9150. But you have known cases where they did succeed?
Yes.

9151. Lord *Sandhurst.*] Your main contention is that the labour market in the tailoring trade is not overcrowded?
That is so.

9152. Therefore you disbelieve in the cry of excessive hours and starvation wages?
Yes.

9153. And this you say, having a knowledge of the poorer classes in the trade?
Yes.

9154. Lord *Thring.*] Do you, or do you not, allude to the coat-making only, or to the whole tailoring trade, including vests and trousers?
I allude to the coat-making only, because in the others there are not any Jews engaged; I only represent the Jews.

9155. *Chairman.*] I understand you combat Mr. Burnett's statement that the visit of the Factory Inspector is reported from one house to another, so that everything is made comfortable and ready for his visit?
I certainly do.

9156. But are you speaking only for yourself or for the lowest class of contractors also?
I certainly could not answer for all; but on the face of it, it seems unlikely for a man to allow a neighbour of his to assist him in evading the law; at that rate he would be able to make the coats cheaper than he could himself.

9157. Is there not a sufficient bond of fellowship between the Jewish contractors to lead them to help each other in that respect against their common enemy, the law?
I do not think your Lordship should speak of the common enemy of the law; I do not recognise an inspector as the common enemy of the law.

9158. I am afraid the law is looked upon by those who habitually break it as the common enemy, is it not?
Yes.

9159. You said in your evidence yesterday that the result of the introduction of machinery has been to benefit the labourer, because if it had not been introduced, and if the present system was not in existence, the Englishman would buy in the cheapest market, and would now be wearing imported clothing?
Yes.

9160. But

9160. But we were told by Miss Potter that in your trade, the coat trade, an English coat was of so peculiar and inimitable a character that it would not be possible for a foreigner to compete with the English coat trade?

It would not now, after having been established here; but when the trade was first introduced the public would know no difference, and would accept the other as the original thing.

9161. That is, before this high quality of the cutting was established the foreign competition might have arisen?

It might.

9162. But now it has driven it out of any possibility of competing?

Yes, out of any possibility of competing; for I have it on the highest authority that we manufacture in our trade thousands and thousands annually for the American market. I am informed that there is a large prohibitive duty upon goods there, and yet they are able to manufacture them here and send them over to America; and even on those very goods labels are sewn on "London make."

9163. Would you assume, therefore, that we produce a superior garment to what they do there?

Yes.

9164. You stated that the quotation made from you by Mr. Burnett, at page 17 in his Report, was not furnished by himself?

No.

9165. Was it not furnished to the Toynbee Hall Committee?

No.

9166. Was this the history of it; "Case 11 deserves quotation in full, as it contains incidentally a full statement of the condition of the trade from the point of view of a large master sweater, whose name had been given as a reference. Mr. Moses has already been referred to, and employs about 30 workers. Works for Hyam and Co., and for export trade;" was not that statement made by you?

I made a statement to a gentleman calling from Toynbee Hall.

9167. And is not that the statement you made?

No, he misrepresented my statement. May I explain to your Committee? Immediately on seeing this Report, I went to Toynbee Hall, and asked to see the Reverend Mr. Barnett, and asked if he would favour me with the original copy relating to my statement that he had given to Mr. Burnett. He told me that Mr. Burnett had the original, and that he could not give me a copy.

9168. Then you say that this statement which has been put forward as being made by you to the representative of the Toynbee Hall Committee does not represent your views?

No, it has been misrepresented. I thought it was very unfair at the time of the Reverend Mr. Barnett when I asked him to give me the original copy that I might have commented upon it; but not having given me the original copy I could not take any further steps.

9169. You say that the complaints made of the crowding of the work into the last three days of the week is not due to any action of the contractor to reduce the price of labour, but is entirely owing to the cutters of the employers?

Yes, that is so.

9170. And that if the cutters chose they could so arrange the work that it could be easily spread over the week?

Yes. Perhaps an order comes in on Monday; it is kept over previous to being cut, till the latter part of the week, and when it comes to the last moment the tailor is driven. If it is not in to time, a cab may be sent down for the coat, which is charged to the tailor, a telegram may be sent for the coat, which is also charged to the tailor, and deducted at the end of the week. These are very

 serious

serious statements, but I am prepared to corroborate them with witnesses that have suffered from them.

9171. Earl of *Limerick.*] May they not get sudden orders themselves that oblige short notice to be given to the tailor?
Yes, it may be so in instances.

9172. *Chairman.*] Has your society ever made any general representation to the employers that it would be far more convenient, and that the work would be better done, if it was spread over the whole of the week instead of given at the end in the way that appears to be the practice?
May I explain to your Lordships. A few years ago, after this meeting failed of which I have spoken, we tried to establish a Master Tailors' Protection Association, and thought that by that means we should be able to combine and just see without using any harsh measures, whether we might not introduce an improved system. I was appointed as President of this Association, and I was strongly in favour of the hours of labour being reduced. I was overruled in committee, and I resigned my membership from that association, and that has been the cause of its falling; it entirely broke up.

9173. Then you are in favour of reducing the hours of labour?
I am.

9174. Should you be in favour of their being regulated by Act of Parliament?
No.

9275. Only by a voluntary agreement between the men and the employers?
Certainly. I suggested that we should pay our men per hour; if a man has work, 7 *d.* per hour, pay him 7 *d.* per hour; if 6 *d.*, pay him 6 *d.*; and if at any time we should come to an understanding about reducing the hours of labour, there would be no difficulty in allowing it. When the worker wants to reduce the hours, and keep his pay the same, there is the difficulty.

9176. In fact, what you mean is to abolish the system of paying by piece, and substitute for it a system of paying by the hour?
Yes.

9177. And how would you ascertain what a man's value is per hour?
The same as we do now per day.

9178. Earl of *Limerick.*] Taking what has been called a 3 *s.* coat, would you estimate in any way as regards a coat at 3 *s.* how much would go in wages, and how much you would receive for yourself, and how much for the expense of the workshop?
I cannot answer that question. You may get more out of one 3 *s.* coat than you would out of another. It is a peculiarity in the trade that you cannot very well explain to those who do not know about the trade. There are certain goods that you can make up much quicker and get them out of hand; but others you could not get out of hand so easily.

9179. Lord *Clinton.*] It depends upon the material, does it not?
Yes.

9180. Some material is more easy to work than others?
Yes.

9181. Earl of *Limerick.*] It has been represented to the Committee by previous witnesses as if an estimate could be arrived at on coats and other articles, that so much went in wages and so much went to the master and for expenses of the workshop; you say there is no means of arriving at it?
No means.

9182. And therefore that any estimate of that nature must be fallacious?
Certainly; they could not arrive at it; I do not see how they could.

9183. You think there are no reliable estimates on it?
No, there are not.

9184. Lord

9184. Lord *Monkswell.*] Do you not find that at the end of a day of 13 hours the work of the last hour is not so good as that of the first hour?

If I give you my candid opinion I always find the last two or three hours of the day's work the best part of the day.

9185. How do you account for that?

I can hardly account for it, but it is a fact which will be admitted by whoever will be questioned on this point. I always find that the last two or three hours of the day you get the most part of the work done.

9186. You do not think a man would do better work if he worked shorter hours?

No, certainly not.

9187. You think a man can work full stretch 13 hours a day?

Yes.

9188. And that he does?

Yes. I remember when I was a lad there was no system in our trade; it is a vast improvement at the present day. I say that this system of long hours can be obviated if the men will agree to receive payment by the hour.

9189. *Chairman.*] Have you anything to add to your statement?

Yes. This will be corroborated by a witness who has been a journeyman and a master tailor for a few years, Samuel Spyer. He is a journeyman again, and, I think, he will tell you that it is more profitable to be a journeyman than what it was when he was a master tailor. Adverting to the evidence of Mr. Spyer, I may remark that the last straw which proved too much for him in his relations with Messrs. Hollington, was a line of coats numbering (I do not know exactly the number) 50 or 60, which were sent to him to have new sleeve-linings put in, and to be re-pressed. No price being put upon the work, he naturally enquired of the firm what they would pay. He was informed that if the work was all right the price would be all right. From this he naturally inferred that he would be well paid. He was therefore very careful in getting them up. However, he was considerably surprised after the goods had been passed as satisfactory to find a check handed to him with the figure 2, on which on closely inspecting he found to represent not 2 *s.*, but 2 *d.* per coat. After an endeavour of three weeks to see the manager, he succeeded at last in doing so, but the only satisfaction he got was being referred back to the foreman, the manager refusing to interfere in the matter. Mr. Spyer will inform you that he then took out a summons against Messrs. Hollington, which was post-dated four weeks. Three days previous to the case coming on he received a letter informing him that the amount of his claim, which was ninepence per coat, had been paid into court. Thus they had kept him waiting seven weeks for his money; and they paid the money into court because the work was worth it, or else they would not have paid the money into court.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Miss RACHEL GASHION, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

9190. *Chairman.*] Are you in the employ of Mr. Moses?

Yes.

9191. As a button-holer?

Yes.

9192. And you are paid by the button-hole?

Yes.

9193. How much a button-hole do you receive?

A halfpenny.

9194. How much can you earn a-week?
I have taken as much as 26 *s.*

9195. That is your maximum?
Yes.

9196. You have heard it stated to the Committee that Mr. Burnett in his report says that 4 *s.* a-day is the most that a button-holer can earn; do you agree with that?
I can earn more.

9197. Have you been making button-holes in this room?
Yes.

6198. How many button-holes have you made?
Four.

9199. And in what time did you make them?
Thirteen and a-half minutes.

9200. And did the Committee Clerk check your time?
Yes.

9201. Did the Committee Clerk also check each button-hole?
Yes.

9202. Will you read out what the time was for each button-hole?
Four minutes the first, three and a quarter the second, three and a quarter the third, and three minutes the last.

9203. You made four button-holes in 13½ minutes?
Yes.

9204. Therefore you would have earned 2 *d.* in thirteen and a half minutes?
Yes.

9205. That would be at the rate of 9 *d.* an hour?
Yes.

9206. And would you consider 9 *d.* an hour a good wage for a female hand to earn?
Yes.

9207. Lord *Clinton.*] Is that your ordinary rate of work when you are working?
Yes, I can work like that. I felt a little nervous when I was doing it here.

9208. But you do, as a rule, work as fast as that?
Yes.

9209. All through the day?
Yes.

9210. *Chairman.*] How many hours do you work in the day?
From eight to eight.

9211. With an hour for meal times?
Yes.

9212. And any time for tea?
Half an hour.

9213 That coat (*pointing to a coat*) is the coat you have been working upon?
Yes.

9214. Will you show it round to the Committee?
(*The Witness does so.*)

9215. Are

9215. Are you considered a specially expert button-hole maker?
I suppose so.

9216. Are there any quicker working in the same place with you?
Not quicker than I am in Mr. Moses' workshop. There are quicker. I know one who can work four button-holes more in an hour.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

SAMUEL SPYER, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

9217. *Chairman.*] WHO do you work for?
At the present time I am a journeyman, working at No. 18, Pelham-street, Brick-lane.

9218. Have you worked for Messrs. Hollington?
I have.

9219. Did you hear the evidence given of the treatment you received at their hands?
I did; I gave the evidence personally.

9220. You only received 2 *d.* per coat?
I can give you the detail. I received one day a line of alterations, with no instructions and no price, and I made it my special business the next morning to call upon the firm to know what they were to be done to. They told me what to do with them. I then asked likewise, "What may be the price of them?" The foreman answered, "When you do it right the price will be to satisfaction."

9221. Did you enter into any agreement with him as to what the price should be?
I did not.

9222. Then you took it, relying entirely on what they chose to give you?
Yes; the time I estimated as close as I could at an hour and a-half. It took a little longer, but still I thought I should take it at the least; and any mechanic in the trade would say it is a full hour and a-half; and when they were brought in two days later they were passed as satisfactory, and I gave them what we call a check or label. The foreman passed it to the clerk, and placed a figure at the back of it with a 2.

9223. May I ask why you did not enter into any contract?
I asked the foreman in the morning what they might pay. The foreman answered me, "When you do it right you will be paid right."

9224. Why did you not ask him what he meant by "right"?
It was the general custom of the firm to send out alterations, and never tell the price to be paid until they came in complete; because I used to have alterations which were paid to satisfaction, but then they were one at a time, but this was a quantity which I am speaking of now.

9225. You left yourself entirely in the hands of Messrs. Hollington as to what they should pay?
Yes.

9226. And you were dissatisfied with the amount that they paid?
Yes. I had asked the foreman what that figure is; he said, "Cannot you read?" I said, "I can, but I do not like to read this figure, because I do not like to do it at this price." He said, "I cannot give you better." This lasted three weeks. I had work of them at home which I wanted to finish with the last quantity of work which I brought in. I then asked the foreman whether he

he would be so kind as to settle up with my alterations; he said, "You can never have any better than I have offered you."

9227. Now will you go to the summons?
Then I said, "I should like to see the head manager;" and I told the head manager that I wished to have payment for the alterations. He said, "I have nothing to do with that; here is the foreman." I told the foreman I should take proceedings. He said, "You can do as you please." The next morning I took proceedings, and when I went to the court, it was the 1st of the month, and the hearing had been the last of the month; that was another four weeks.

9228. What was the amount of your claim?
Ninepence a coat.

9229. And that they paid into court?
That they paid into court.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MORRIS MARKS, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

9230. *Chairman.*] ARE you a machinist?
Yes.

9231. Were you formerly President of the London Tailors' Machinist Society?
Yes.

9232. Is that the same society as Mr. Lyons mentioned in his evidence?
Yes.

9233. Will you say what are the average wages that are paid by contractors; are they in accordance with those stated by Mr. Moses?
Yes, Mr. Moses' statement is quite correct.

9234. That is the general rate of wages throughout the trade?
That is the price for a workman who considers himself a workman.

9235. And as compared with the prices stated by Mr. Lewis Lyons, Mr. Moses' are nearer correct?
I should say that Mr. Lewis Lyons' statements are not correct in any particular.

9236. What are the hours of work?
Some work from seven to nine, and some from eight to ten.

9237. Have you ever heard of cases of 14, and even up to 22 hours of continual work?
No. These greeners who come here, and have been here only a fortnight, seem quite as expert as the men who have been here for years; they are brought up to it by their own friends.

9238. Have you anything to say of the special customs in your trade?
Nothing in particular.

9239. There is no particular custom to which you wish to draw the attention of the Committee as to the giving out of the work?
No. As a journeyman I do not understand how the big houses give out their work; only as a journeyman I can understand how we work.

9240. But as regards the evidence given by Mr. Moses on the subject of wages and hours of work, you wish to corroborate that as a journeyman tailor?
Yes; that is quite true.

9241. Earl

9241. Earl of *Limerick.*] What are your wages?
Nine shillings a day.

9242. And what is the average number of days' work per week, taking the whole of the year?
I can hardly tell that. If I kept an account I could tell; but there are some shops where they may be very busy.

9243. Take your own, for instance?
I could not tell. I should think about 4½ days or 4¼ days; it is very hard to tell; I should think 4½ or 4¼ would be my average earnings.

9244. At 9*s.* a day?
At 9*s.* a day.

9245. Do you think that yours is an exceptional case, that the majority work for fewer days per week on the average than you do?
No, it is not an exceptional case at all.

9246. You think yours is the average?
It is an average wage.

9247. But I suppose you are one of the best workmen?
No. Mr. Lewis Lyons is as good a workman as me, but he will not work; that is the difference.

9248. Do not you consider yourself a first-class workman?
No, a mere machinist; what I call a good machinist, but nothing extra.

9249. There are some who get more?
Some get 10*s.*; my own personal friends get 10*s.* a day.

9250. And what is about the lowest?
For men, they get from about 4*s.* to 6*s.* or 6*s.* 6*d.*; that is, plain machinists.

9251. I rather meant of the class that you belong to; you are not a plain machinist?
I am a good machinist. Of course there are some machinists who take 7*s.* 6*d.*; but I am better than they are.

9252. You think that yours fairly represents the rate of wages of the good machinists?
Yes, that is the fair average.

9253. Lord *Monkswell.*] How long have you known a man work at a stretch, as the longest time?
They may work a half-hour over, but not a good machinist or a good presser.

9254. Do you mean that you have never known a good workmen work more than half-an-hour overtime?
They may work an hour on the Thursday when they want the pay, and if they are busy they may work an hour-and-a-half, but that is unusual; but when our Sabbath comes early on a Friday, we generally work on the Thursday for an hour or an hour-and-a-half, so as to get paid for a full day's work.

9255. You have never known a man work more than one-and-a-half hour's overtime?
There may be cases, but very few. I have been in the society with 300 men. I can corroborate Mr. Moses' statement as quite true; in fact, among those witnesses that were here, there was not one but was with me, for say, six or seven years. As to Mr Plattman's statement, I was the president when he was one of our committee, and his statement that he receives 10*s.* a week, average wage, is quite false.

9256. How do you know that?
Because three years ago when we were together, he told me distinctly that he was

was getting 7 *s.* 6 *d.* a day, but now he works piece-work, as he stated here. He said he got a shilling a coat, and his statement was that he can make 6 *s.* or 7 *s.* a day, and a question was put to him, whether there is anyone who can make more, and he said then, no one in the same shop. Now, if I was put to piece-work at a shilling a coat I could make 11 *s.* a day; and so could any other man that is a practical machiner.

9257. Some more?
Ten or 11; 11 would be the utmost, but 10 would be a fair day's work.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MISS ANNIE SESSIONS, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

9258. *Chairman.*] ARE you a Christian?
Yes.

9259. Are you employed for Mr. Moses?
No.

9260. What do you do?
I am a baster.

9261. And what are your earnings?
Four shillings a day.

9262. Are you paid by the day or by the piece?
By the day.

9263. What are your hours?
From eight to eight; an hour for dinner, half-an-hour for tea.

9264. Have you any general knowledge of other female basters in your trade?
Yes.

9265. You know a great many?
Yes.

9266. Do you know of any who work for longer hours than eight to eight?
No.

9267. Do you know of those who work in the smaller workshops; what are called "sweaters' dens"?
No.

9268. You have no acquaintance with them?
No.

9269. You only know those who work in large workshops?
Yes.

9270. What are your average earnings a-day?
Four shillings a day.

9271. Is that all the week through?
About four days on the average I make in the week.

9272. Generally speaking, you corroborate the statements we have heard from Mr. Moses as to the hours and wages of female hands?
Yes.

9273. Lord *Monkswell.*] When you say you work only four days on the average, is that because you cannot get work for the other days?
I do not work Sundays, and then I do not work after Friday.

9274. *Chairman.*]

9274. *Chairman.*] Are there any Jews employed where you work?
They are all Jews.

9275. Except yourself?
Except myself.

9276. Do you get on well with them?
Yes, I like them to work with.

9277. Do you find that amongst the Christian female workers generally there is any indisposition to work with Jewesses?
None at all.

9278. There is no jealousy entertained of them as being better workers than the English?
No.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Miss JANE SESSIONS, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

9279. *Chairman.*] Are you a Christian?
Yes.

9280. What is your employment?
Machinist.

9281. What are your wages?
Four shillings and fourpence a day.

9282. And are you a more especially skilled person than the average?
No; a plain machinist.

9283. Have you any knowledge of the lower class of contractors' shops?
No.

9284. You only know the better class shops, such as Mr. Moses'?
I think they are all conducted on the same principle.

9285. All you have any experience of?
Yes.

9286. Whereabouts are you working now?
Mr. Mark Moses'.

9287. Do not you know that in the East-end of London there are a number of small shops in which only two or three are employed?
No, I do not know any.

9288. You have no experience of them if there are any?
No.

9289. You have heard the evidence given by Mr. Moses and the other witnesses?
Yes.

9290. Do you agree with it?
Yes, I believe it to be true.

9291. And you have no complaints to make of the rate of wages or the hours during which you work?
No.

9292. Do you always get your clear hour for dinner?
Yes.

9293. And the half-hour for tea?
Yes; and I get paid for overtime.

9294. Full pay for the whole of the overtime?
Yes.

9295. Have you ever seen the factory inspector?
Yes, they have been in the workshop.

9296. When you are paid overtime, have you seen your overtime entered in the Book, No. 40?
No, I have not seen it entered.

9297. You do not know that such a book exists, perhaps?
Not that I know of. I always get my wages when I have done.

9298. But are you aware whether there is a book in which the overtime that you work is entered?
Yes, I believe it is entered in a book.

9299. But you have never seen it?
No.

9300. Earl of *Limerick.*] Are there any rules hung up in the workshop?
Yes, just underneath where I sit.

9301. Can you read them?
Yes.

9302. Taking it throughout the year, about how many days a week do you think you work?
From four to four and a half days.

9303. Taking the year all round?
Yes.

9304. Are the workpeople at Mr. Moses' principally Jews?
Yes.

9305. Are you on friendly terms with them?
Yes.

9306. You find no difficulty; no bad feeling?
No; I have always worked with Jews.

9307. If it was stated that there is any bad feeling between Jews and Christians you would not agree with that statement?
No, I should not.

9308. Lord *Monkswell.*] Is your machine found for you, or do you have to hire it?
It is found.

9309. And with regard to overtime, how often do you have to work overtime?
Once a week; on Thursday night.

9310. How long?
An hour sometimes, and sometimes an hour and a half.

9311. That is the most?
Yes.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

13*th July* 1888.

MISS RACHEL GASHION, having been re-called; is further Examined, as follows:

9312. *Chairman.*] YOU have to find your own gimp and twist, have you not?
Yes.

9313. At what cost do you find that?
It costs me about 4 *s.* in the week if I earn a sovereign.

9314. So that if you earn a sovereign your net earnings would be only 16 *s.*?
Yes.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. JULIUS LEVY, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

9315. *Chairman.*] WHAT are you?
A master tailor.

9316. Have you any experience of the practice adopted by the cutters of the employers?
Yes, I have. If you will allow me to explain it, I have worked for a shop of the name of Baker's, in the Strand. I worked there for a long time and they sent me a line of coats; the name of the cutter is Mr. Wright; they sent me a line of coats, overcoats, 5 *s.* a-piece, and in a few months after, when the slack time came, he sent me the same goods, in the same make, 2 *s.* 6 *d.*; 16 for 2 *s.* 6 *d.*, and eight at 3 *s.*, and I refused it. They were sent home, and I refused to make it. I sent him a letter, and I sent him a book to book it for me.

9317. Is it the general practice to have it booked?
Yes.

9318. So that you may have it in writing?
Yes; he sent 16 at 2 *s.* 6*d.*, and eight at 3 *s.*, and I refused to make them. He kept me without work till now; he would not give me any work any more.

9319. That is to say, because you declined to do the work at the price he offered, he would not give you any more?
Yes.

9320. What objection have you to that?
Because I would not labour under price.

9321. I suppose he got it done somewhere else?
He may have had it done somewhere else, but I would not do it. I pay my people a high price; I have told him that. I pay my presser 10 *s.* a-day, and my machiner 9 *s.* a-day.

9322. And your inference is, that if you did not get the job, somebody else got it who does not pay his people so much; is that so?
Yes; I have worked for another firm for two years. Last winter they sent me home waterman's waistcoats with sleeves; I am in the waistcoat and suit line as well; we generally have had 3 *s.* 6 *d.* for them; last winter he offered me 2 *s.* 6 *d.* I went into the shop and asked him if this was the price; he said, yes. I took them back, I refused to make them; he said if you refuse to make them I cannot give you any more work; he would not give me work up till the present time. If it were not that I have another place to fall back upon, I would certainly starve with my family; that shows that it is not the governor's fault at all; it is only the cutters' fault, because they do just as they like.

 9323. I suppose

9323. I suppose the cutter is the agent of the employer, is he not?
Yes.

9324. Do you say that these prices are fixed by the cutter without reference to the employer, or by the desire of the employer?
I suppose the governor does not know anything about it, because if the tailor grumbles the cutter discharges him.

9325. Who pays you?
The cashier.

9326. Do you mean that the cutter charges one price to his employer and gets them done at quite a different price by you?
He wants to show that he is a good servant to his employer; he gets his work done as cheap as he can.

9327. You do not say that the cutter makes any undue profit out of this?
No.

9328. Whatever profit there may be goes into the pocket of the employer?
It goes into the employer's pocket.

9329. And I suppose that this job had to be done somewhere, and if you did not do it he got it done by somebody else at his own price?
Yes, somebody else does it. I have asked the cutter for work; he says "I cannot give you any more work because you refused that work." I said "I cannot make it for that because I do not earn anything by it." He said "Somebody else can make it." I asked him who made that work. He says to me "There is a man of Piser, he has worked here for 24 years." I said to him "I know that man; he has got all his own children at home, he can do it." If the labour is done in that family the father pays to the children the wages and the children give them to the mother; but if I pay my people they take it out of the house; that is the only difference.

9330. Then what you say is that you cannot compete with the smaller contractor who pays a lower rate of wages than you do; that you cannot compete with the man who has a family at home, and who, therefore, can get the work done by his own family?
Just so. I have been working lately for another firm, a City firm; this is their address; it is a show shop (*handing in a card*). He employed me five or six weeks, and every week he sent me alterations; I have got them here in the book. Coats ripped to pieces which I found out was his own fault. For instance, a coat is too low in the neck; it falls in the back; he made me rip the collar and make a new collar. I found two or three jobs like them, and every week it was the same; so I told him: "I cannot do alterations for nothing." He says to me "Then if you cannot do alterations for nothing, I cannot supply you with work." This is the reason he sacked me, and I threatened him; I sent him a letter; if he will not pay me I shall sue him for the amount he owes me, 18 *s.* 6 *d.*; I shall give him till Saturday.

9331. In that case you were paid nothing at all for the alterations?
No.

9332. You were expected to do the work without receiving any remuneration for it?
Without being paid for it.

9333. But in the other cases you suppose that somebody else was willing to do the work that you refused at the price that you declined to do it at?
Yes. I explained to him why they can do it; they have got their own children and I have not; I do the pressing and machining and everything.

9334. And you decline to employ labour at so low a wage as to enable you to compete with the persons who take the prices which you decline?
Yes.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

13*th July* 1888.

MR. GABRIEL WORTMAN, is called; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

9335. *Chairman.*] WHAT are you?
I am a shopkeeper in the Whitechapel-road.

9336. Have you been a cutter?
I have been apprenticed to a tailor, and I have been a journeyman tailor, and I have been a master tailor. I worked myself up to a foreman cutter in the City in many places.

9337. What was your duty as a cutter?
My duty as a cutter was to measure a gentleman when he comes in, and sometimes to give it to be basted up, and to try it on to fit the garment, to give out the work to the tailors and to take them in and to examine whether they were put together right, made right according to my own knowledge.

9338. Part of your duty was after the garment was cut out and basted to give it out to the contractor?
I have been in the bespoke work.

9339. Have you ever given any work out to contractors outside?
I always gave out the work that was given outside. We kept one workshop upstairs, only the men were not able to make all the work that we used to get in, and we were obliged to give it outside.

9340. When you gave it outside was it work that you cut out yourself?
The same work that I cut out myself.

9341. What part of the week did you cut it out, early or late?
Sometimes we mislaid some work. Monday, as a rule, we did not start to work so hard as we were at work during the week. We come a little later and we began to give out the work, but suppose we took on Saturday 20 garments, and they were wanted, some of them, the next Saturday, some of them during the week, some of them on Monday or Tuesday, and suppose they were mislaid, sometimes that occurred. Of course my duty was to have the garment done by the time. Speaking the truth, many times it was mislaid; for one reason and another it was not given out; perhaps some mistake was made by an entry in the book of the material which the gentleman gave the order for, and the garment was mislaid until the last two or three hours; and, of course, after we found it out we were obliged to have it done which way we could. I did not want it to come under the notice of the governor, and then I was obliged to tell the tailor that he should hurry to make it as quick as he possibly could, and he should bring it in.

9342. Would that be exceptional?
Yes.

9343. Very exceptional?
Yes.

9344. In the bespoke trade, at all events, his orders, as a rule, are spread fairly well over the week?
Yes, if he can do so.

9345. But you cannot speak at all of the ready-made trade?
Of the ready-made trade I cannot speak much; I can only say this, that when I did work at the tailoring as a master tailor, before I went in as a cutter, I tried once, when I went to a wholesale house, and took the same class of work that Mr. Moses mentioned, but I could not get a living, although I worked all the week.

9346. As I understand you, then, in the bespoke trade it depends entirely, excepting

excepting in these exceptional circumstances which you mentioned, upon when the order comes in as to when you put it out?

Yes.

9347. It depends, therefore, upon the customer, and not upon the shop?

Sometimes upon the shop. As I stated, it might be mislaid because of the entry in the book, and sometimes by the fault of the cutter himself. I have heard it mentioned by some witnesses here, I believe by Mr. Moses himself, that by the mistake of the cutter the tailor has to suffer. I must corroborate that, and say it is the truth, though I was myself in it. I have myself done it. Suppose I took a measure, and by some mistake I cut the garment too big; the gentleman comes in, and it is too big, and they have to take it in and make the alteration; I give it to the tailor. It all depended on what master I was under; if I was under a strict master I could not put it down in the book to obtain the full price which the tailor wanted for the alteration, because it would be against myself.

9348. And so the man who makes the coat has to suffer?

The man who makes the coat has got to alter it, and he has got to suffer; and the tailor himself could not go to the governor to state that I would not pay him for the alteration, because then I would dismiss him. If I could not dismiss him there and then, I should find some fault or another very soon so that I could dismiss him.

9349. Therefore it may often happen that when these alterations have to be made they may have to be made for nothing, through no fault of the maker, but of the cutter?

Yes. Speaking the truth, we cutters were not likely to find fault with ourselves; we should find fault with the tailor. I was in a place eight years as a cutter. I used to receive 4 *l.* a week, and some way or another a few years ago we had not got the proper season for our trade. This year the weather got bad, and we did not take orders then for light stuff and flannel stuff.

9350. And that is the reason, you think, that the trade is slack this year?

I do. I know I have got experience in both ways. I worked in the country as a journeyman. I used to take out work from shops, of course the better class of work; I never could make a garment at 5 *s.* or 6 *s* to get a living.

9351. Did you ever receive any instructions to keep back work from the employer; have you ever been told by the employer, "Keep this work back till the end of the week in the hope that we may get it cheaper"?

No; but suppose after Christmas it was a slack time, in January and February we do not do too much——

9352. I asked you, did you ever know your employer say to you, or to any cutter in his shop, "Keep the work back till the end of the week"?

No; if we have done it, it has been our own fault. But what I want to explain is this: Supposing after Christmas we had done nothing, and orders had not come in, and the governor said, "Well, could you not try to have a cheap article made up, and then we should get customers to come in;" I would say, "Yes, we will try." Suppose it was a garment that was 10*s.* What price could I pay, I asked the governor. "Try it as cheap as you can." A tailor comes in, I cut out a morning coat suppose, or a frock coat of good material, nicely made with extra work in it; a tailor comes in, and I say to him, "Would you like to make me a few garments for the window, cheap?" As a rule, the tailor will say, "What will be the price for it?" I would say, "About 7*s.*" He says, "Do not you pay 10*s.*?" I say, "Only now it is slack times; if you get 7 *s.* it is better than nothing." Some tailors will refuse and be independent; but some tailors will say, "If you give me a chance to earn something by it, I will take it;" to give him a chance of a few garments at a better price.

9353. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury*.] Then are they made as good as the pattern?

Yes,

Yes, sometimes better. The same is the case amongst cutters and foremen, as in other trades. Another foreman-cutter will come into the governor and say, "If you will engage me I will take less price, and I shall get your work cheaper done, because I know a good many tailors who will make the work cheaper than you get it done."

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Martis, 16° *Julii*, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Lord Archbishop of CANTERBURY.
Earl of DERBY.
Earl of ONSLOW.
Viscount GORDON (*Earl of Aberdeen*).
Lord CLINTON.
Lord CLIFFORD OF CHUDLEIGH.
Lord FOXFORD (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord MONKSWELL.
Lord THRING.

LORD KENRY (EARL OF DUNRAVEN AND MOUNT-EARL), IN THE CHAIR.

MR. WILLIAM JOHN MACQUEEN, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

9354. *Chairman.*] ARE you a partner in the firm of Smith and Macqueen?
I am.

9355. What is the character of the business that your firm does?
It is described as a medium class City business.

9356. What do you mean by a medium class City business?
A medium class retail business. We do some good qualities and have to cater for some of the lower qualities.

9357. Where are your premises?
In Cheapside.

9358. You do not do any export trade?
No.

9359. How many hands do you employ?
We employ two classes of hands; machine hands and hand tailors. Our best goods are made by hand tailors, and the low class are made by machine hands. We employ three machine coat makers and two hand tailors in coats. I am confining my attention now to coats entirely; we employ trouser makers and waistcoat makers too.

9360. Why do you wish to confine your attention to coats?
I thought that was your wish.

9361. I asked you how many hands you employ?
Seven or eight trouser makers, and I think seven waistcoat makers.

9362. And women; do you employ women?
Only for the waistcoats.

9363. Do you do all your work on your own premises?
Not the making.

9364. You put it out?
Yes, we put it out. We do all the cutting on the premises, of course.

9365. Do you put it out to a large number of people?
No, we confine the machine trade to the three coat makers.

9366. When you said that you had got three coat makers, I understood yon to mean that they work on your own premises?
No, not at all; they work outside.

9367. You employ nobody on the premises, except for the purpose of cutting out the work?
Yes; we employ two men for doing the repairs on the premises.

9368. How do you put out this work, and how do you arrange the price at which it is to be done?
For instance, when we take a man on, he either asks the price that we pay for our coats, and I tell him, or the foreman tells him. Every Saturday he takes his wages. His name is entered in the book, and a number corresponding with the number of the order and the style of the garment, the style of coat, and the price paid for making the same. Then there is a total, and on the Saturday the man comes for his wages and has to sign this book as a receipt. He has then the option, if he likes, of going through every item and questioning them. They do not do that without there is some mistake, and then they refer to my partner or myself.

9369. What do you mean by "wages"?
We pay them so much per garment.

9370. Do these men you employ work only for you?
No, they work for other houses as well, I think; certainly they do.

9371. Then it would not be correct to say that you give out your work unpriced?
Yes, it would be correct. We do not price the ticket, but the men know our prices when we engage them; we tell them our prices.

9372. You arrange the price with them when they first begin to work for you?
Certainly; and then it is carried on week by week, and on the Saturday they see them all entered up; they can test every item if they wish.

9373. Do they ever do so?
I imagine they do. They are pretty sharp; they have often called my attention to little mistakes that have occured which have been put right afterwards, showing that they took cognisance of the fact.

9374. It would not be correct then to say that when the work is sent in you pay the men exactly what you think fit?
Certainly not; a misrepresentation entirely.

9375. Have you anything else you wish to say to the Committee?
All the men that have worked for us have worked for us for years; they very seldom leave us; I think that is the best proof that they are satisfied with our system, and the plan that we adopt is the system of the retail house as a rule; the plan of four houses out of five.

9376. What plan do you mean?
Sending the goods out without pricing the tickets. It is not usual in the trade to price the tickets, so far as my experience goes, and I have been in several trades. I think it is more usual in the wholesale houses; I think they price tickets there.

9377. What days of the week do you give out your orders?
Pretty well every hour of the day, as they are cut.

9378. As you get the orders you give them out?
Yes.

9379. Is there much competition to get orders from you?
Yes; when we lose a man we get plenty of competition always to take his place. I may mention we make no fines, or any deductions, or anything of that kind, without it is a case of a man neglecting his work and sending it in two or three days afterwards and the carriage having to be paid.

9380. What

9380. What is the course you follow in the event of the work being unsatisfactorily done?
We have to put it right at our own expense, as a rule.

9381. Earl of *Onslow.*] Who is it done by?
We should give it to a hand tailor, or one of the men on the premises.

9382. *Chairman.*] You said you had two men for repairs?
For repairs and alterations.

9383. You mean, if you put out an order, and the order is not executed to your satisfaction, you would not return it to the man?
If there was time, no doubt it would be returned to the man; but as a rule, things have to be made so quickly in the City that it has to be done in an hour, or three or four hours, on the premises.

9384. Then I presume you would make a reduction in the wages of that man?
No, we do not; many houses do, but we do not press them in any shape, we put up with the loss.

9385. Do you know where your goods go to; where do you dispose of them; do you dispose of them to individual customers?
Yes; gentlemen come in and order.

9386. Earl of *Onslow.*] Your work is given out, I presume, by the cutter?
It is given out by a trimmer, a man who is kept for that purpose.

9387. Is it his duty to cut out the coats before he gives them out?
No, it is his duty simply to trim them and give them out to the work-people.

9388. Whose duty is it to cut out?
I cut myself, and I keep a foreman for cutting.

9389. And there is another man who has the giving out of the work to the tailors?
Yes.

9390. Therefore you know yourself when the work is cut out, and whether it has been cut out at the proper time?
Yes, certainly; I am there all day.

9391. Do you adopt the system of putting checks on the garments when they are given out, stating what is to be done with the garment, and when it is to be returned?
Every garment that goes out has a ticket with instructions upon it, with a counterfoil attached to present for payment on the Saturday.

9392. And do you see to the affixing of that ticket yourself?
Yes, certainly.

9393. The writing it out and putting it on?
Yes. The garment could not go out of the house without the ticket.

9394. *Chairman.*] His Lordship asked whether you saw to it yourself personally?
Either myself or the foreman.

9395. Earl of *Onslow.*] Supposing that your foreman was to lose time, to be delayed over the cutting out of his garment, would he still fix the same date for the garment to be returned?
Yes, it would remain the same.

9396. Then, however much there might be delay in his case, the loss of time would have to be made good by the man who made the coat?
No. Our system is this: In the case of all orders taken to-day, the material is cut out, and they are brought into the cutting-room and given out as they are cut. Some may be required in a short time, some in a week, or some may be

be wanted the next day, according to the order of the customer. If you say no, your neighbour will do it; therefore you are compelled to say yes; and you put the same question to your man, and he says, yes, he will get it done.

9397. When they come back made, who receives them?
Myself or the foreman takes them in.

9398. And you say you never make any deductions?
Take it as a rule, we seldom make any deductions. If I saw anything wrong I should indicate what was wrong, and send it back to the man.

9399. What day do you pay?
Always on Saturdays.

9400. And supposing the work has been badly done, and there is no very great hurry for it, do you send the work that has been badly done back to the man; you said you did in some cases?
Certainly I should, if there was time, and let him rectify it.

9401. And you would not pay him until he brought it back made right, I suppose?
I think he would be paid irrespective of that. We pay for everything on the Saturday; the men send their tickets in on the Friday night, and are paid on Saturday.

9402. But supposing he had done a line of coats with the buttons wrong?
He would not do a line; we are not in the wholesale way.

9403. Supposing he did his work wrong, you would still advance him some money, I understand you?
If the work was completed up to the Friday night, he would be paid for it certainly, if he brought his ticket in.

9404. Lord *Clinton.*] Where is your work done? You say you employ three machinists; where is their work done?
At their residences, of course.

9405. In their own houses?
Yes.

9406. Do you know if they do the work themselves, or do they employ people to help them do it?
They employ people to do it, no doubt.

9407. Is that the same with the women who make the waistcoats?
Yes, they will make them at their own homes.

9408. Do you know if they get people to help them also?
I think it might be the case in a busy season?

9409. But you pay the machinist, and he has to do his work as he can?
We recognise only the one man.

9410. Do you know the houses where they do the work?
We know their addresses.

9411. Do you know anything about them?
I have never been to them myself; but the three men who work for us, I have been told, have very good workrooms; very light.

9412. You have not seen them personally?
I have not.

9413. Lord *Monkswell.*] How many do you employ at home?
Two men for repairs and alterations.

9414. And you say you have also a trimmer, and yourself, and a foreman?
Yes; there are the salesman, trimmer, packer, porter, cutter.

9415. You

9415. You do not know, as I understand, where all these garments go to to be made? You say that some of the people you employ have workshops, but is that always the case; do you know that all the people you employ have workshops?

All the people that we employ have workshops. I am correct in saying that, I think. I have not seen the places, but I think I am correct in saying that.

9416. Therefore you cannot tell but what some of your garments may go anywhere?

No, I think I am pretty sure of it that they are made on the premises; I think you may take that to be correct.

9417. At all events, you or your foremen try to see that that is the case?

We know as a matter of notoriety that the men make them themselves with assistance.

9418. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Do you know if they sub-divide the labour very much?

I think very likely in the usual way that they have the usual branches.

9419. *Chairman.*] If the clothes do not fit, do they go back to the maker?

Yes, sometimes.

9420. In the same way that if they are not properly made, and if there is time, you send them back, and the man has to do them; and if there is not time, you make the alteration yourself?

Quite so.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. ALFRED JORDAN HOLLINGTON, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

9421. *Chairman.*] What is your business?

Wholesale clothier.

9422. Do you export?

Yes.

9423. And do you do a bespoke retail trade also?

I have two retail houses; but they are totally distinct from the wholesale in every sense of the word; they have nothing to do with the wholesale.

9424. Your principal business is the wholesale?

Yes, my principal business is the wholesale.

9425. Your principal place of business is in Aldgate, is it not?

Yes.

9426. Is that the wholesale house

That is the wholesale house.

9427. You do not employ any hands on your own premises, do you?

We employ all the cutters. All the work is cut upon the premises by machine and by hand. There are some perhaps 60 and 70 men, and three machines cutting constantly. It is given out to labour to produce afterwards.

9428. Do you give it out to a number of people?

We give it out to whoever will take it; and as a rule a man who will make a large quantity is the man that suits us best. We get off with less trouble, and get better made work in that way.

9429. You put it out in very large quantities?

Yes; if a man can make 500 garments a week, we give them to him.

9430. How many men do you employ?
I do not know; some hundreds; I have not the slightest idea how many are employed. This man who will make 500 waistcoats a week I cannot say how many he employs.

9431. I mean, how many men make for you?
I cannot tell you; I should think some hundreds.

9432. And you change them about?
We employ them as suits our purpose; they are there waiting for trade and clamouring for it. The man who makes it best we give it to him.

9433. The man who makes it best, and also at the cheapest rate, I suppose?
Distinctly.

9434. Do you know where the goods go to?
I know that they go, a great quantity of them, in the immediate neighbourhood. Lots of them go down into Hampshire, and into certain parts of Essex and Suffolk. They are sent down to the agricultural districts. They are distributed there by intermediate men. We send them down to a man, for instance, in the country.

9435. Do you mean to be made up?
Yes. We send them down by rail at night; the man would receive them in the morning, and he would in all probability do the machine-work upon his own premises, and take them out in a van and deliver two to this cottage and two to that cottage, and two to the next; and this man would drive 20 miles through country lanes and deliver them in all the agricultural districts, to certain people; then he would go down and pick up those and leave others in their stead, and when they are finished they would be sent back to London again.

9436. Practically the whole of the United Kingdom is in competition for this kind of work?
My idea would be principally the garrison towns and agricultural districts.

9437. Why the garrison towns?
Because there are a large number of soldier's wives unemployed, and they are employed upon this labour; and the agricultural districts, because the farm labourer's pay is so exceptionally small that his wife and daughter probably can earn a higher wage than the farm labourer himself; there is more money paid to the man's wife and daughter, or perhaps the wife alone, than he earns.

9438. Do you know at all through how many hands the work filters before it gets down say to the soldier's wife or the wife of the agricultural labourer?
I do not imagine above one.

9439. You do not send out the order to the individual worker?
No.

9440. You send it yourself?
We send it ourselves to the man in the country.

9441. What do you call the man in the country?
A man in the country who sets himself up as a labour-master, and who agrees to make a certain number of garments, and he has those garments sent to him by rail. He gives them out to the remainder of the people; it is his van that he sends round; he pays the hand that takes it from him, and receives it back again. So that it does not filter through any more hands than those two; in fact, the price paid for labour is so limited that there is not any chance of filtration.

9442. You say it only passes through one intermediary between you and the absolute maker of the garment?
Yes.

9443. Where are your goods exported to?
To Australia, to South Africa; very little to America; the duty on clothing is

is prohibitory in America; we have to pay a 57½ per cent. import duty there, and the consequence is that we do not export goods there.

We export goods to Australia in face of a 16½ per cent. import duty for goods into New Zealand.

9444. Do you export any to the Continent of Europe?
No, I do not think there is any clothing exported to the Continent of Europe. There is a good deal to the West Indies and some to the American Islands.

9445. Do you manufacture also for consumption in this country?
Yes, largely.

9446. I do not mean the bespoke trade.
I mean the wholesale clothing trade; we have country dealers all over England, Scotland, and Ireland.

9447. The same class of goods that you export?
Yes. The home trade goods are made better than the export trade. They are the same, and made by the same people; but, as a rule, the home-trade buyer will pay a higher price to have his goods better made than the export buyer will.

9448. How do you get your orders for abroad and the Colonies?
Books are sent out, patterns are procured, and goods are bought of the manufacturers six months before the season. There are pattern lengths then made; they are cut up into little pieces and made into a volume, and each wholesale house in the colonies has one of these books sent to it by us, and they indent from that for the quantity they want; perhaps 100 pair of trousers to these patterns, 100 coats or 100 children's suits, whatever they want.

9449. And they send that order direct to you, do they?
No; they send it, as a rule, to their London house. If we trade direct with a house in the Colonies, we give offence to the London houses.

9450. What do you mean by the London house?
The London house of the Australian house; all the best Australian or foreign houses have their London house, where they buy for the Australian or foreign house.

9451. And they send the order to their London agent?
Yes.

9452. And he sends it to you?
Yes, he gives it to us.

9453. And you send it to the man in the country, and the man in the country gets it made up.
We manufacture it to all intents and purposes; we get the cloth and cut it up.

9454. You send a portion of the work to the man in the country, and he gets them made up?
Yes. I do not say in the country entirely. A large portion goes into the country, but a large portion is made round the warehouse.

9455. How long have you been in this business?
Twenty-five years.

9456. Is there much change in prices you pay for getting the work done?
No. The prices paid in the retail trade when I first started were higher.

9457. In the wholesale, is there any difference?
I think there is very little; if anything they are lower.

9458. Slightly lower?
I think they are; but I do not think that they are any lower in proportion to the work; I believe that the work is done worse.

9459. Has the price of the goods diminished?
Yes, very seriously.

9460. To what extent?
In some instances as much as 45 to 50 per cent.

9461. And the work is not as well done as it was, you say?
No, and it is getting worse every year.

9462. How do you account for that?
Through the doing away with apprenticeship, and the difficulty of getting any labour at all that knows its business.

9463. How do you account for that difficulty in getting men who know their business?
There is no doubt that there is an enormous glut of the low-priced labour; that is to say uneducated and unskilled labour is to be got at in any quantity, and the work is competed for to such an extent that the price is kept at a ridiculously low level; whereas the moment you get to educated labour it is impossible to procure it. If you want a man to make a pair of trousers, and who knows his business, you cannot get one for love or money; but if you want a sort of human machine for getting it together by hook or by crook, and making it available to sell at a low price, there is any quantity to be got.

9464. Do you think that the nanufacturing is done more in the country than it used to be, that it is leaving London?
I think the London houses are sinking, undoubtedly, the bulk of them, because labour is cheaper in Leeds than it is in London; labour is cheaper in some of the manufacturing towns than it is in London.

9465. We have had it in evidence that the tendency is for manufacturers to close their places in London, and to go into the country; would that be the case, in your opinion?
I do not think there ever have been many manufacturers in London in the sewing way. I think that the trade is leaving London for the country, inasmuch as the labour there is cheaper, and of course the houses that are established upon the spot would have an advantage over the London houses, inasmuch as they would not have the carriage of the goods to and fro to pay; and then they are nearer to the absolute manufacturer of the stuff itself, the raw material.

9466. Can you tell the Committee whether the class of goods you make are in competition in the Colonies with foreign goods of the same kind?
Do you mean continental goods?

9467. Continental goods?
I think so; and I think we are fast losing caste, being out-run.

9468. Are the foreign goods better, do you mean?
The foreign labour is educated, and ours is uneducated.

9469. Where are the foreign goods chiefly made; in Germany?
In Germany principally.

9470. Do you mean that they can make a better class of goods than can be made in England?
They can make a better class of goods for less money.

9471. How do you account for that?
Because they have educated labour. No man in Germany is allowed to practise a trade until he has served three years to a master, and then he obtains a certificate of merit, and with that certificate he can go into any shop and get his living. But here we have a Jew glazier without a home; he is emigrated to

to this country, and settles in Spitalfields. In a week's time the Jewish Board of Guardians lend him a machine, and he is immediately a full-blown tailor. That is the sort of material we have to use, and it is not likely that our goods are going to be as good with that class of labour as the goods made by the labour of a German, who will work at a less price than that man will, and who knows his trade.

9472. I gather from you that you think the present position of your trade in that respect is not a very healthy one?
I think it is very unhealthy.

9473. And what would you suggest in the way of remedy?
I would suggest some kind of technical education.

9474. Could you give us anything more definite as to what you mean by "some kind of technical education"?
I mean that every child when he leaves, or before he leaves, the Board School, should have certain hours of the day devoted to the ordinary common usages of trade.

9475. You do not advocate any system such as that you have mentioned as being in existence in Germany?
I should say that would be the prelude to it; undoubtedly that is what I mean; to lead up to that. It is exactly what we want, and until we get it we shall not be able to keep our supremacy as manufacturers; if we do not get some education for our labour we shall no longer exist as the manufacturing country of the world.

9476. Can you speak at all as to the number of foreigners in the trade in London; I mean tailors?
Enormous quantities.

9477. Has the proportion of foreigners to English tailors diminished or increased during your experience?
I should think increased; in fact, English tailors are things of the past.

9478. What are the foreigners mostly; Germans?
Principally Jews. I do not know that they are Germans much. There are a few German tailors about; and where we have any German tailors they are the best we have.

9479. I gather from you that your opinion is, that the uneducated cheap labour has produced a cheap, but rather nasty class of goods?
Yes.

9480. And that it is not a demand for a cheap and nasty class of goods that has produced the influx of this uneducated labour?
Not at all.

9481. Has machinery been much introduced into the trade of late?
Nearly everything is done by machinery now; there is hardly anything that is not done by machinery.

9482. Much more so than formerly?
Much more; and, being done in larger quantities, it all has a tendency to reduce the cost of production.

9483. In your opinion, would any legislation tending to increase the cost of production have the effect of our losing the foreign trade altogether, the export trade?
Undoubtedly.

9484. It could not bear any increase in the cost of production, you think?
No. The manufacturing houses are not making any large profits; the manufacturers themselves, of whom I might be called a representative man, are not making any large profits; in fact, in bad times, in a bad six months, or in a

surfeit of bad debts, we should not be getting more than 5 per cent. on the capital employed; and if you reduced that, we should have to take our capital out, and chance it in something else.

9485. How do you describe the men who put your work out to the people who make it for you; do you call them cutters?
No; the giver-out and taker-in of work; we advertise for them in that way.

9486. Have you executed any Government contract?
Yes. You have some evidence on that subject that you have obtained from one of my men, which is a deliberate tissue of falsehoods.

9487. That is Mr. Price?
Mr. Price.

9488. Was he employed by you as a giver-out or taker-in of work?
That is so.

9489. We had it given in evidence by Mr. Price that you executed a contract for 400 Government coats for discharged soldiers; is that so?
It is wrong in the amount; it was 1,500.

9490. Is what he says correct as to the price: "We paid 3 *s.* 6 *d.* or 4 *s.* 6 *d.* (I forget which, but my impression is that it was 4 *s.* 6 *d.*) on making a sample, but when the bulk came in we paid 2 *s.*" That is on page 407, at Question No. 4130?
That is perfectly untrue.

9491. Perhaps you would just explain it?
When invited to tender, a sealed sample or samples are laid before the contractor in the pattern-room at Pimlico; attached to each garment you find a label specifying full particulars; to these all houses sending in tenders are expected to adhere. Garments are sometimes sent up simply to show any suggested improvements, but have no bearing upon the contract, and, in fact, a 42 *s.* coat might be sent to show an improvement that could be introduced into one at 13 *s.* This (*producing a document*) is the order which was sent from the War Office, or wherever they give it out, and that will show you that what I am stating is perfectly correct.

9492. Does that relate to this particular order?
To this particular order (*handing in the document*). You will see distinctly there that they refer to their own garment, and to their own specification.

9493. The "pattern and specification" up here in the corner of this document is their own pattern and specification?
Yes, which is labelled and sealed, on their table; and it is usual for the contractor, supposing these patterns get obsolete, to make a suggestion that such-and-such a thing is more fashionable; and he would send up a garment to explain to the man in charge what he meant. That is not the garment referred to by Price, because there was no sample of that nature sent; but that is a usual thing to do.

9494. What does it mean here by "to samples for body and lining submitted with tender"?
That is, samples of materials.

9495. You say that this tender for 1,500 coats is the same as the contract that Price spoke of for 400 coats?
It is.

9496. Do you mean that you never had any other?
No, I have never had any other tender for overcoats; we took over from Messrs. Hyams when they failed their contract man, and he had been in the habit of doing work for the Government, and he naturally introduced to us the same work which he had been getting for Hyams. Previous to that we never had any tenders at all from the Government. This Mr. Price was in our employ about three months, and was discharged to the best of our belief

belief for taking bribes from the workmen to give them out work better than they could do. He was discharged at a moment's notice, and summoned us for two weeks' wages; and in lieu of us going to Court to waste time, we paid him one week's wages, he paying the cost of the summons.

9497. In answer to Question 4130 he said, "We paid 3 *s.* 6 *d.* or 4 *s.* 6 *d.* on making a sample?"
That is perfectly true.

9498. Can you tell the Committee what the price was?
We did not make a sample for that order.

9499. I understand the witness to mean there that you paid 3 *s.* 6 *d.* or 4 *s.* 6 *d.* for a certain sample that was sent in to you?
No.

9500. He goes on to say, "but when the bulk came in we paid 2 *s.*"?
We had no sample in to us.

9501. In a case of that kind do you put out the whole of the 1,500 of the coats to one man to make?
No, to different men; 30 or 40 to one man, 100 to another man, just as they will take them. The Government give you a specified time?

9502. Do not these men submit to you the way in which they are going to make it up?
No; we submit to them a sample of what we want carried out.

9503. And I understand in this case you did not undertake to pay more than you did pay when the goods were brought to you?
We never undertook to pay anything; we simply took the order of the Government to make a garment to a signed and sealed sample at a certain price; there was no undertaking on our part to pay any special price for making it.

9504. I am not talking of the Government at all; I am asking whether this is correct; whether the price which you stated to the manufacturer of the goods for you was larger than the price that you did give when the goods were sent in?
I do not follow your Lordship's question.

9505. You put this order out to certain people to be made for you?
Yes.

9506. At a certain price, I presume?
Yes.

9507. I want to know whether you paid that price when the goods were sent in?
Undoubtedly. We give every garment out with a ticket, and on that ticket is stated the price for making, and the moment the man brings it back to the warehouse the ticket is signed, and he goes to the foot of the stairs and receives the money.

9508. Do you put a check on each garment?
On every individual packet; he may have 20 in it.

9509. Lord *Sandhurst.*] Those coats are inspected before they are paid for, I suppose?
Distinctly

9510. *Chairman.*] Then it is further suggested, in answer to the next question, No. 4131, that "The sample that had to go to Pimlico to the Government factory to be examined for this contract for the 400, was of superior cloth and of superior make; but when the bulk of the 400 were given out, they were given out at 2 *s.* each, with inferior cloth and inferior linings"?
You see the fallacy of that, because it is perfectly untrue. If you are tender-

ing for a specific sample of Government, you cannot be sending a sample of your own.

9511. Earl of *Limerick.*] What is meant by "to sample for body and lining submitted with tender"?
The materials that are to be made up.

9512. You do not send in any samples of the made-up garments, but of the materials?
Yes.

9513. *Chairman.*] And you accept the Government patterns and specifications at a given price, and you send in a sample of the materials that you are to use?
Yes, that is so.

9514. That would not disprove the allegation in this evidence, because it is to the effect that the cloth that you submitted was of a superior quality, and the cloth of which you made up the garments was of an inferior quality?
He would not know what the cloth we sent in was at all; he would not see it.

9515. I will ask you, quite apart from his seeing it, whether that was the case?
It was not the case. He would not see the cloth that was submitted; it would be out of his department entirely.

9516. Do you wish to explain anything further to the Committee on that point?
No, not more than what I have told you, that he was discharged for what we believed to be dishonesty.

9517. I do not want to know anything about that, but I mean, can you explain to the Committee as to this alleged way in which you fulfilled this contract with regard to the coats?
We fulfilled it to the satisfaction of the Government, who passed the goods and paid for them; and moreover, since this man's evidence was given, the same department has given us another order for a thousand suits; they would not have done that, I suppose, if they had been under the impression that that evidence was correct.

9518. What do you mean by "suits"?
A coat and a waistcoat and a pair of trousers is a suit.

9519. What are those suits for, do you know?
For discharged soldiers, I apprehend.

9520. Earl of *Onslow.*] They are not uniforms, then?
No; neither are these uniforms. They are all civilian clothing. The object of seeing the patterns is that they do not want to give a livery for discharged soldiers; you would not make the 1,500 all alike, or else you would be putting them in livery. You submit a set of patterns of different colourings and materials, so that the men may have what is practically a civilian overcoat.

9521. *Chairman.*] Do you know at all what inspection the goods are submitted to at Pimlico?
No, I have not the slightest idea.

9522. When do you generally give out your orders?
At all hours of the day.

9523. And every day in the week?
And every day in the week.

9524. And a regular time is specified for bringing them in?
No; they come in every hour in the day, and every day in the week.

9525. Do you allow a certain time for them to be executed?

We

We expect them to make them as quick as they can; there is no specified time.

9526. How are the payments made?
The payments are made the moment the garments are in.

9527. Lord *Thring*.] With respect to these 1,500 coats, I understand you to say that the Government gave you out a sealed sample, that you made them to that sample, and that they were approved by Government as being equal to that sample?
The Government show and retain their sample; otherwise that is so.

9528. The whole 1,500?
The whole 1,500.

9529. Did I understand you correctly to say that you thought there was no demand for cheap and nasty goods, but that the supply of cheap and nasty goods had created the demand?
I think it does so; I believe if the labour were better and the goods were better, they would command a higher price.

9530. Do you think, then, that being, as you have told us, in competition with the Germans abroad, supposing you made them better and they were also dearer, you could still maintain the trade?
I think so.

9531. You think the customer would be willing to pay a higher price for a better article?
I think so; if he could get the labour satisfactory, undoubtedly. In fact, I think we have lost our trade with Australia, the bulk of the higher priced trade with it, from that fact alone, because our articles were so inferiorly manufactured that they did not compete with the colonial-made goods.

9532. In other words, you think that cheapness has been a detriment instead of an advantage?
I think, undoubtedly, that the want of education in the labour is a detriment.

9533. With regard to machines, that is a different question altogether; the machines, I suppose, legitimately, in your opinion, make the supply cheaper, do they not?
Yes, undoubtedly.

9534. That is not inferior work?
I consider a machine-made article, if made by a technically educated man, is as good as a hand-made article. I would not mind having in a garment I wear myself a certain amount of machine labour in unimportant parts of it.

9535. You do not object to machine labour but to bad labour?
Yes, that is so.

9536. As to the labour in the agricultural districts, I suppose that it is women's labour that is employed in the agricultural districts, is it not?
Entirely.

9537. And do I understand you to say that that is general throughout England; I ask the question because it is not my experience at all?
I think so.

9538. However, it is very largely extended, you think?
I do.

9539. That the wives of the labourers work for the tailors?
Distinctly.

9540. Could you tell us at all what proportion of goods you suppose to be made in agricultural districts; what proportion of the whole of your output of goods is made in the agricultural districts?
I daresay, perhaps, a third.

9541. And principally, I think you said, in Essex and the neighbouring counties?
Essex, Suffolk, and Hampshire.

9542. And about what price, do you know, do the women receive for their work, a day; what are their earnings?
I daresay, perhaps, 8 *s.* or 9 *s.* a week.

9543. As much as that?
I should imagine so; from 6 *s.* to 9 *s.* a week.

9544. But that you are not actually acquainted with, I suppose?
Not at all; I cannot state that from absolute knowledge.

9545. Does the labour master work himself, or does he simply act as an agent and distributer?
I should think he acts simply as an agent and distributer; it is too large a thing for him to do any work on it.

9546. He keeps vans to go round the country, you say?
Yes, and keeps men to go with the van as well. I think it is so large a thing that he would not work himself. He may have machines in his own factory where he does the machine labour, and he gives out the portions to be done by hand labour to this district labour which I have spoken of.

9547. Earl of *Onslow.*] You say that it is utterly untrue that you have ever sent any sample in to the stores at Pimlico, but that the goods that you made were made from samples supplied from the stores at Pimlico?
No, I did not say that it was utterly untrue that we ever sent any sample in.

9548. But in this particular case?
We might have done it in this particular case just in following out the suggestion I gave you.

9549. The suggestion was that you might have sent in a high-class coat?
Yes, to give them a suggestion; you want to put as much effect of something better as you can upon the low-priced article; and if we thought that their sample was obsolete, we should in all probability send in a sample of more modern mode with a view of their adopting our suggestion in their own garment.

9550. Then can you recollect, as a fact, whether that happened in this case?
I cannot. It is entirely in the hands of the manager of that department, and I have read you his report; I am giving you that report only as a report of his. I allude to the statement I read about a sealed sample or samples being laid before the contractor.

9551. But then can you recollect what did happen in this case with regard to the sample that was sent to you from Pimlico?
The sample is not sent to us; the sample is lying on the table at Pimlico. The man goes there and sees it, and be has to send in a tender upon that to be made equal in every way to that sample.

9552. And what may have happened is, that you may have sent another coat down as a sample, and said, "We would recommend such-and-such alterations as being more in accordance with the fashion."
Yes.

9553. And in that way you think that a better class of coat may have been sent in than you actually made when you made the 1,500.
Yes.

9554. Earl of *Limerick.*] Without any intention on your part of making the coat in accordance with the sample which you possibly sent in?
Distinctly.

9555. Earl

9555. Earl of *Onslow.*] Supposing that to have happened, would the Clothing Department at Pimlico have made another coat to be the sample?

No, they would simply have accepted our suggestion, and the goods would have gone in and have been passed with the increased facilities or increased production upon them; there might be a little difference in the shape, or an extra pocket, or a different width of sleeve, or any suggestion that fashion might dictate; and the man in charge there, I suppose, would accept the improvement, and it would be understood that the coats were going to be made with that improvement.

9556. Then you would have undertaken for the Government to make a coat in all respects according to the sample coat shown you at Pimlico, with certain improvements suggested by yourselves?

That is it.

9557. What was the amount you were paid for those coats?

Twelve shillings and eightpence we were paid for them.

9558. Are there any other houses in the trade that have similar coats?

Yes, they had a portion of the same contract.

9559. Do you know what the contract was; was it 4,000?

I think it was either 3,000 or 4,000; yes, they appear to be 4,000 here; 2,500 of one size, and 1,500 of another. We were given 938 of one size, and 562 of another; so that I should apprehend by that that the contract was 4,000. I know it is usual to divide the contracts.

9560. Had you ever had a similar contract before?

No.

9461. Do you know whether that was the first time that such a contract had been put out?

I think not; I think such a contract had been put out before.

9562. For discharged soldiers' great coats?

Yes.

9563. You do not think that this was on experiment?

I do not.

9564. You have not brought your tender with you?

No.

9565. Do you recollect whether there was a clause in the order providing that the work should be done in a factory?

No, there was no such clause.

9566. Is there such a clause in the recent orders which you have received?

Yes, there is.

9567. Have you a factory?

We have what is virtually a factory; we have a man entirely in our employ at Bury St. Edmunds who has a factory, and he has undertaken with us that those goods shall be made entirely in his factory.

9568. And he works on his own account and takes the contract from you?

Distinctly.

9569. He is not your servant, merely a sub-contractor?

A sub-contractor for the manufacturing in the factory. If that clause had not been in, we should not have done it that way; we should have given it out, as we did the overcoats, to various parties; but inasmnch as that clause was in, we did undertake to have it made in our factory.

9570. You could not carry out a contract containing the Government clause in London?

We have not a factory in London; and I do not think there is a factory in London.

9571. Has the insertion then of the factory clause in Government contracts the effect of driving the trade out of London?
I think so, undoubtedly.

9572. Therefore the workpeople in London suffer from the existence of the factory clause?
Undoubtedly they lose the manufacturing of those suits.

9573. Do you know of any factories existing in London?
I do not. I fancy that one of the police contractors has a factory in the Burdett-road, but whether he employs his own people, I do not know; I am rather under the impression that he makes the bulk of his goods at Crewe.

9574. Do you employ this manufacturer at Bury St. Edmunds for other work?
Yes.

9575. Constantly?
Yes.

9576. Then I suppose that the work which you otherwise would give him if you had not got this Government contract in hand you have to put out to the contractors?
No, I imagine he would take them both in.

9577. He has room for both, has he?
I think so.

9578. Then it does not displace any other work out of the factory?
No; at least it must drive it to some extent out of the factory if the factory were extra full, but I do not apprehend that it will in this case.

9579. Did I understand you to say that this German system of apprenticeship was provided by law?
Undoubtedly, I take it so.

9580. And you would recommend the adoption of something similar in England?
Undoubtedly I would.

9581. What, under those circumstances, would become of the unskilled labour; what would it find to do?
There would be no longer unskilled labour.

9582. But I am talking of those who now exist; the enormous number who now apply to you for work?
During the process of educating the others they would gradually die off. Supposing the unskilled labour and the educated labour were going on correlatively, you could not have the educated labour available in 10 minutes, because you would have to wait while it was educating and leavening the mass. The two could be employed, and the leaven of the educated labour would make the other so much more available.

9583 Then you think that while the process of education was going on these people would still continue to go on existing?
I do, undoubtedly.

9584. Mr. Price in his evidence at No. 4143 has this question put to him: "A sweater (that is a sub-contractor) getting large orders from the passer, very generally gives him compensation in money?" and his answer is, "Yes, commission." Is that so?
No, that is only his stealing; it is nothing more. It is perfectly unusual and unnecessary for a man receiving work from a wholesale house to pay the man who gives it out, and takes it in for giving it to him.

9585. But

9585. But is that so. I understand you to say that there is very great competition for this work; may it not be the case that a man would give a bribe to the passer for the sake of getting it?

You see all garments are not made of the same price, and they are not of the same quality of work, and all hands are not equally competent to do certain work; and it is quite as easy to bribe the man who gives you the work to give you higher priced labour than you are competent to make. If he gives you garments to make at 2 *s.*, and you are only competent to make them at 1 *s.* 6 *d.* each, and he gives you 3 *d.* out of the difference, he is a gainer of 3 *d.* himself; and Price did this, or we believed that he did it, and was discharged. We could not call him up and say, "Did you take from this man a bribe?" because he would have said "No;" but we traced it to our own satisfaction that he did in several instances, and we discharged him for doing it.

9586. He gave the man a class of work which he was incompetent to do, as I understand you?

Distinctly; that is the way it is done.

9587. Is it never the case that where there are four or five men, all of whom are competent to do the work, one of them gives a bribe to the passer, who thereupon gives the work to him in preference to the others?

It is just possible; but that is highly improbable.

9588. Have you any means of finding it out if it does exist?

Only by engaging men of good character for the purpose of doing this work, and watching by their daily mode of life as to whether they look to be living beyond their means. Of course it is one of the most important parts of the entire business, and it is a thing we watch very narrowly. We have a man in the department, one of the highest men in the house, who is always walking about and taking notes, and it is very difficult for a thing of that sort to exist for long. We have discharged many men for it, and we have discharged them of course without exact absolute proof, because it is impossible to secure an absolute identification of the thing. If we could prove it absolutely, we would lock the man up, so as to make him an example for others; but our only means of dealing with it is to discharge the man when it takes place.

9589. But you look upon it as a very serious offence, and one to be visited with instant dismissal if found out?

Distinctly.

9590. You said that the labour in the country was cheaper; did you mean skilled labour, or unskilled labour?

Not cheaper than London labour.

9591. I thought you said so?

No.

9592. Then why did you say that the trade was going to the country; to Leeds, for instance?

I am referring to the country districts which we employ, as compared with our London labour, and you are referring to a district we do not employ at all; Leeds. The labour is cheaper there than it is in London.

9593. Which; skilled or unskilled?

Unskilled.

9594. Then, low as the wages are in London, they are still lower in the provinces?

Yes, in Leeds; but the skilled labour is so scarce that it is impossible to procure skilled labour. It obtains a higher wage to-day than I have ever known it obtain. Educated tailors, practical tailors, are more valuable to-day than they ever were, and there is employment for masses of them who cannot be procured.

9595. Earl of *Derby.*] Then, as I understand you, those who are without employment are for the most part not competent to do the work?

Distinctly.

9596. Lord *Clinton.*] I think you said there was a good deal of what is called sub-division of labour in your trade; a good deal of the practice of dividing labour into different departments; that is to say, one workman does a certain portion of the work, and another workman a certain other portion?

I fancy that it is made in that way; but it is not under my absolute cognisance. I have no intimate connection with it; nothing in connection with me touches that. I just give the garments out to a man, who takes them away and reproduces them at the door; he takes them away unfinished, and brings them back finished; and I have no hesitation in saying that to the best of my belief he sub-divides the labour; that is to say, he would have one man at the machine, another man basting, another man pressing, and another finishing, and another making the buttonholes.

9597. But you do not know how, or where, the work is absolutely done?
No.

9598. Do you think that that sub-division is a good thing, or a bad thing, first for the tradesman, and then for the person employed on the work?

I think it is a good thing as regards the production of goods at a cheaper price; it tends to produce the same quality of labour at a less cost of production than it would the other way. Goods made in bulk, and by labour sub-divided, would be made up at a less cost than one man doing the entire work.

9599. Now, will you take it in the interest of the working man; is it his interest that he should learn only a small portion of the trade?

No; I think every man should learn the whole trade through, the same as I had to do.

9600. You think, therefore, that the sub-division is a bad thing for the working man?

I think that the loss of apprenticeship is the ruin of the country.

9601. Earl of *Limerick.*] It is a necessity of the cheap trade?
It is a necessity of the cheap trade.

9602. Lord *Clinton.*] Do you apprentice boys?

No. We apprentice them to the cutting in the warehouse, and teach them that particular department, or rather they do not get apprenticed; there is no deed of apprenticeship; you take a lad in, and give him 8 *s.* or 10 *s.* a-week, and he gets on from that to 35 *s.* or 40 *s.* a-week, the ordinary wage of the mechanic.

9603. But if the system of apprenticeship were adopted again, you think that a boy should be taught the whole of the trade, and not merely a particular portion of it?

Yes, I do; and I think if he had a certain amount of technical education from the School Board, the amount of apprenticeship necessary, the time necessary would be so small that it would easily be obtained.

9604. With regard to the inspection of your work, you said that you did not know what sort of inspection it went through at the Government office?
No, I do not.

9605. Do you believe it is inspected?

I believe it is, undoubtedly, because we get a reply to say that "certain goods have been inspected and the money is waiting for you."

9606. Did you ever have any goods returned?
Never.

9607. Earl of *Limerick.*] Do you know of your own knowledge that the Jewish Board of Guardians lend machines to persons just come over, who have no knowledge of the tailoring trade, to enable them to set up as tailors?

I do not know that they do it the next day; but the facts lead me to think that they do lend machines to these men. They have no workhouse; they lend a man a barrow,

a barrow, or give him 5 *s.* to buy some oranges, or lend him a machine, or anything they think he is adapted for; they find money to put him to something.

9608. My impression was that you said that they lend these machines to men just come over?

I do not mean that they do not find what the man's capacity is in the time, whatever it may be, that he has been in this country. They may bother about with him for a month perhaps, but my own impression is that they do not support him in idleness; that they find the trade which he is most adapted for, and they advance him either tools or money to start him fairly in that trade; and then, as I tell you, in less than a fortnight he is a full-blown tradesman in that particular business.

9609. As I understand, you do not object to educated foreign labour coming over?

No.

9610. But to the uneducated foreign workmen who are not acquainted with the trade when they come over, and are only capable of producing bad and very cheap work?

Yes. You see we have room for the educated labour, but we have not room for the unskilled labour. My contention is, you know, that the cause of sweating is the surplus or surfeit of uneducated or unskilled labour. That is the whole origin of the thing; and is caused by the immigration of Jews, and by the Jewish Board of Guardians, and the large proportion of women who work at the trade. That is what the surplus is composed of.

9611. But if there was not a very great quantity of this very poor labour, the cheap clothing trade could not be kept up, could it?

Yes, the cheap clothing trade would exist; and a man would earn more money as an educated man than the unskilled labourer does as it is; a man would do more work in a given space of time with education than he can do now uneducated. The uneducated labour produces so much less in proportion to what educated labour would do, that the wages paid now per garment would make a much higher wage to the labour if it were educated.

9612. But would it produce that class of goods which would compete with foreign production in the colonies?

Undoubtedly; it does now.

9613. At a sufficiently low rate?

Yes, at a sufficiently low rate; I think so; that would be my opinion. Of course, it could be but an opinion; but it would be the opinion of a man who is thoroughly acquainted with the business.

9614. Lord *Sandhurst.*] With regard to these statements that you have made about the Jewish Board of Guardians, do you know them to be true of your own knowledge?

I have never been a member of the Jewish Board of Guardians; I am not a Jew; but it occurs to me to be knowledge that it is indelibly impressed upon my mind as correct, and I cannot tell you how I got it.

9615. A sort of rumour, in fact?

I do not think it is rumour; I think it is almost borne out by the fact of the enormous number of Jews that there are employed in the trade.

9616. Now, as regards the man who takes his work out from the shop, did you say that he is a practical tailor himself. Supposing you have 100 coats, and a man comes and takes away these 100 coats to make up, is he generally a practical tailor?

Yes, as near a practical tailor as is procurable. I do not say he is a practical tailor, but he is as good as any of them; he is the best of the crew that make them.

9617. You do not know where those goods are going to be made up?
They go into labouring workshops all about the place. I know that they are not very many yards off, at all events, not many miles off.

9618. And when you give this work out to a man, do you know his system of doing his work?
No, not at all.

9619. Then do you think that there is any possibility of these coats being sub-let again by him?
I do not think there is sufficient margin in the price; that is not likely. You are quite right, when talking about the high-priced businesses westward, as to that being done; but in the wholesale clothing trade the price is so low that there is no means of sub-division.

9620. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] With regard to the work that is sent out, I suppose you do not trouble yourself with regard to the sanitary condition of the places where it is made, whether in the town or country?
Not the slightest.

9621. You mentioned that you believe that there are only two stages in the sub-division of the work; might there not be half-a-dozen stages, without your knowledge?
What do you mean to infer from that; that there is half-a-dozen men?

9622. I am alluding to your answer to the noble Lord in the Chair, as to the amount of sub-division, and I understood you to say that you believed that the work only goes through two hands, that is to say, that the man you gave out the work to would give it to the operator?
Yes; I believe that to be true all round; but, in replying to the noble Lord, I was simply suggesting that the work sent into the country, and taken away round the country lanes, only went through two hands.

9623. Have you had any opportunity of noticing the effect of these institutions, where technical education is given to a certain extent in the way of enabling the young men who are taught there to find good employment; such an institution as the Polytechnic, for instance?
I do not know about the Polytechnic; but I know, with regard to the technical institution which has been established in Huddersfield, for the instruction of the cloth-manufacturing people, that since it has been established we have had a very much higher class of merit upon the lower goods than we ever had before.

9624. You mentioned that there was a great difficulty in getting skilled workmen; do you think that among the men there is any increasing recognition of the fact that if they take pains to qualify themselves they will command a better price for their work?
I do not know that they would know much about it. My impression is that it is almost impossible to obtain it in after life. It must be obtained in youth, and it must be by a system of apprenticeship to qualify them for the post.

9625. With regard to the clause in the Government contract as to the work being done in a factory, what would the definition of a factory be?
A factory is a building in which the garment is commenced and finished. For instance, it is untied from the bundle, and is sewn and pressed, and buttonholed, and returned in its entirety, without being given out. For instance, the man making those suits would not be able to take them round in his van, and drop two here and there, to get them finished at an easier price by that means than the other way; he would be compelled only to employ on those suits people who were able to go into a factory and stop in it during the factory hours. The bulk of those people I speak of are unable to go into a factory at all; first, from the distance they live from the factory; and secondly, from their inability to work factory hours.

9626. Reverting for a moment to the evidence given by Price, is it possible that

that he may have seen a coat which was sent in by you to Pimlico for the sake of suggesting alterations in the shape, &c., and that he supposed it was also a sample as to quality?

No, I do not think so. I think it was entirely malignant evidence, given with a view to injure a house that he had already injured.

9627. You understand that I am referring now merely to that one point in his evidence?

My opinion is just the same on that point.

9628. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] You said that the system of apprenticeship was dying out; have you any reason that you can give us for that; have you any idea in your own mind as to why it is that boys do not learn trades?

I take it that it is owing to the ease with which they can get employment without learning trades.

9629. But supposing that technical education was given in the Board schools, do you think that the boy who has had a technical education as a carpenter would be any use if he took to being a tailor?

No. Why should he not have technical education as a tailor? Why do you put it as a carpenter?

9630. I wanted to know whether you thought that technical education in one branch would make a man more skilled with his hand, and so likely to be a cleverer workman in another branch?

He would undoubtedly be the better for it.

9631. As I understand you, you rather think that it would be necessary to have some regulation, like the Germans, to oblige a boy before he took to a trade to have got some technical education, and, if he had not got it at the Board school, to acquire it elsewhere?

Distinctly.

9632. Because it might be the case, might it not, that at the Board school a boy might very easily be taught something for which he had no choice; which he did not like?

I would give the boy his choice of the technical trade which he would choose to follow, and I would give him an early insight into that technical knowledge at the Board school. I do not want you to educate at the Board school a tailor; I do not want you go through the processes of making a tailor at the Board school; I am quite willing to take the Technical Education Bill as it stands, and that it shall not be meant that you are to teach a boy his trade, but to teach him there the preliminary things that will qualify him for it.

9633. And you think that would be sufficient?

I do. I think if we got that, and if you would not allow them to practice their trade unless they had a certificate, the inducement would be so great that they would get it.

9634. But the possession of a certificate, you think, is an important part of the scheme?

Yes, I do. The German certificate goes thus far; that if a man is not qualified at the end of three years, they send him back to his master, and that is in order to further qualify him; and if at the end of the fourth year he comes up still unqualified, they refuse that boy a certificate, and he is walking about the world as a waif and stray; no German would employ him, and he has to leave the country. We have nothing of that kind here.

9635. Lord *Monkswell.*] Do you pay less for the work done in Bury St. Edmunds, where you say you have a factory, which is virtually your factory, than in town for the same work?

Only the cost of carriage less.

9636. Then there is a slight difference?

Yes; a slight difference in favour of London.

 9637. I want

9637. I want to know whether you pay exactly the same wages at Bury St. Edmunds?
Exactly the same wages, deducting the carriage.

9638. But that would not be exactly the same wages. You get it done rather more cheaply at Bury St. Edmunds?
The labour does not get quite as much at Bury St. Edmunds, but I consider that the labour at Bury St. Edmunds is better paid than the labour in London, because it is able to live cheaper and better in a country district than it can in the heart of a town; rents are lower in a country district.

9639. You say that the customer is willing to pay you more for a good article; if so, why do you not employ more skilled labour at higher wages?
Because we cannot get it.

9640. That is to say, you would have to pay too high a price for it?
I said we cannot get it; I went further than you do.

9641. It would seem that the German system, of which you have spoken with approval, is not successful from one point of view; because it does not keep up wages; you say that the German wages are lower than ours, notwithstanding the system of apprenticeship?
I think so.

9642. Then from the workman's point of view, there is very little encouragement to adopt the German system?
But it does not follow that because the German wages are lower ours would necessarily be lower.

9643. Does not the increase of cheap locomotion account also for the glut of labour; because now people can get unskilled work all over the country taken to them by railway?
I take it that it is the increase of population wanting education.

9644. But locomotion would have something to do with it, would it not; you can send down your parcels for next to nothing into the country?
I do not find that; I think that you pay a large price for the carriage of your parcels.

9645. *Chairman.*] Do you know anything of the technical schools in the country?
I know the one in Huddersfield, and I have seen the good produced by it. I have seen men who went to that school produce tweeds at the same price of a much higher quality than they produced before they went there.

9646. Have they any such school in London?
I think not.

9647. In Bradford, have they one?
I think they have; but the only one I personally know is at Huddersfield, and that has brought home to me the absolute advantages it has conferred.

9648. How many of these givers out and takers in have you in your employment?
Four or five; sometimes four, sometimes five.

9649. Who prepared this paper about the procedure as to Government contracts, which you read to us just now?
The man who has charge of our contracting department, who came to us from Hyam's.

9650. He has charge of the whole department dealing with Government contracts?
Yes.

9651. I understand you to say that as regards this Government contract, it is

is possible that you sent in a pattern showing certain improvements upon the Government pattern?
Yes.

9652. Do you know whether the order was executed with those improvements or without them?
I should say it was executed with them; but I do not know that of my own personal knowledge.

9653. I suppose the head of the department would know?
Yes.

9654. Is it very customary for these patterns to be sent in showing certain improvements?
It is only in the event of a pattern becoming obsolete, Supposing the sealed sample has been in existence for seven or eight years, it would be better for a little improvement.

9655. At the same price, do you mean?
Distinctly; it does not interfere with the price.

9656. Then you are giving the Government something more for the same money?
No, we are not giving what costs us any more.

9657. The improvement does not cost any more?
No.

9658. Can you tell the Committtee how you get your orders in the retail trade?
By customers walking into the shop.

9659. Do you sell the goods yourself in your own shop?
I do not; I have not done it for these 20 years.

9660. I thought you told the Committee that you did a wholesale and retail business?
Yes; I have two retail houses of my own in London.

9661. But the question that I asked you is in reference to them; I thought you meant by retail trade the goods that are made and sold in this country?
No, that is all wholesale. The retail is in two retail shops in main streets.

9662. Earl of *Onslow.*] Is the retail all bespoke?
No; both bespoke and ready-made.

9663. *Chairman.*] Do you supply a large quantity of ready-made tailoring besides that which you sell in your own retail shops?
Enormous; we sell very little in our own retail shops.

9664. How do you get your orders?
By the country travellers calling upon the people, and people coming up to London and walking into the warehouse in London and buying.

9665. By "the people" you mean your agents, I suppose?
We have commercial travellers who go through the country with samples and take orders for a dozen articles, perhaps, or 20; and then they send them up every morning.

9666. What means have you got of knowing how the work is conducted in the factory at Bury St. Edmunds?
Not very much.

9667. What means have you got of knowing that the work is done there at all; how can you know it?
Perfectly; because there is an absolute contract that it shall be.

9668. But you know no more about than that this man, who has the factory at Bury St. Fdmunds, contracts that it shall be made there?
Yes, and I have no doubt whatever that it is.

9669. But it would not come under your knowledge in anyway if the work were put out?
He would not put it out.

9670. That is your opinion. It would not come under your knowledge, would it, if it were put out?
It would leak out; it would be impossible for him to do without its becoming known.

9671. You mean that you would not give that work to anybody, unless you felt morally certain that it would be done in the factory?
Yes, I feel perfectly certain that it was.

9672. Earl of *Derby*.] Do I understand it to be part of your proposal that no one should be allowed to work at a trade, or any of these trades, without having obtained a certificate as to fitness?
I think to a limited extent, yes; and after a limited period.

9673. That is to say, you would not leave it optional to a young man whether he should take the certificate or not, but you would compel him to take one on penalty of not being able to follow the trade?
Distinctly. I would use the principle of the old Guilds of London; only I would extend the principle of the old Guilds of London to the entire country. Originally, a man did not practice a trade in London, unless he was free of his Guild, which meant that he had absolutely served an apprenticeship to it. I would just simply apply that to the entire country.

9674. Was not that to which you have just alluded complained of as a great restriction to trade?
It was complained of that it was a restriction to London. The complaint was not that the thing was an objection, but that it was restricted to London; and London, as the Guilds put it, was confined in three and a-half square miles of the country, a circle which it would be perfectly absurd to adopt in the state of the country now.

9675. Earl of *Aberdeen*.] If you had reason to believe that some of your garments were being made in places where there was not a proper regard to cleanliness, would you consider that objectionable?
I would.

9676. Would you take any steps in such a case?
I should stop the output.

9677. At present are steps taken to ascertain the character of the places?
No, we should not seek the information. If the informatian came to us, we should stop giving work out there; if it did not we should not seek it.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. CHARLES EDWIN SHEPPARD, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

9678. *Chairman*.] ARE you a member of the firm of Nicoll and Company?
Not by deed; but I have an interest, and have been 31 years in their service, for the last 10 years sole manager of the chief establishment in Regent-street.

9679. What is the nature of the business carried on by Messrs. Nicoll and Company?
Tailoring.

9680. Wholesale?
Wholesale, export, and retail.

9681. Have you anything that you wish to read to the Committee?
Yes, I have. I attend before your Lordships to give evidence in direct contradiction to statements made by a witness named Lyons, examined before your

your Committee on May the 11th, he being the only witness who made reference to my firm. I do not know whether I should be right in speaking of this man or giving you any idea of his antecedents.

9682. I think you had better confine yourself to the particular points you have come to give evidence upon?

You see everything depends on this man's veracity, and the correctness with which he placed the statements before you.

9683. What particular point in his evidence do you allude to?

You had a witness before you on Friday last who gave evidence; he was formerly the president of the London Tailors' Machinists' Society; named Morris Marks. Of this society Lewis Lyons was the secretary, and I understand he embezzled the funds——-

9684. I told you that I think it would be better if you would confine youself to disproving the particular statements you wish to correct?

I should be in order, I suppose, in giving some outline of the business?

9685. Quite so; anything to do with your own business?

I would point out, to start with, the serious, moral, and also the pecuniary, injury this man has done our firm by giving false evidence, unchecked by any cross-examination, and which evidence has without any possibility of contradiction, been spread abroad for the past two months.

9686. Earl of *Onslow.*] "Without any possibility of contradiction," you say; but you have been summoned to contradict it now?

Yes, quite so, now; but the evidence was given two months since, and during that time there has been no contradiction whatever.

9687. *Chairman.*] You consider that a hardship has been inflicted by your not being examined sooner?

Yes.

9688. I think you had better go on, and speak to the matters which you wish to speak to?

The firm has been established for nearly fifty years, during which time it has always held a prominent place in public estimation. In our various houses we give employment to over 700 workpeople, exclusive of the employés in the business. The great majority of these workpeople are paid by the cashiers of the firm, and work on the premises where we conduct our business. We also give employment to a staff of employés, numbering nearly 200; and, I venture to say the wages and salaries we pay would compare most favourably with any house in the kingdom; and I can make this statement, which I believe few houses can do, that through all these years of general depression our rate of wages has never been lowered, and that we pay higher wages now than at any time during my thirty years' connection with the business. Its Regent-street establishment, which is under my immediate control, has workshops situated in Warwick-street at the back of, and forming part of, the Regent-street premises. It is here that our retail trade, and the principal part of our wholesale and export trade is manufactured, and it is to these workshops that the greater part of the witness Lyons' evidence has reference. After hearing my testimony, you will find how utterly untrue this man's statements are, and I hope it will be in your Lordships' power to mark your sense of it. I will now proceed to analyse and contradict this man's evidence, statement by statement. He begins by saying, "At the back of Nicoll's premises in Regent-street there is a row of houses in Warwick-street. They were formerly dwelling-houses, but they are now partitioned." In contradiction to this statement, I have to say that, with the exception of three rooms, these four houses never were dwelling-houses, but were built specially for workshops by ourselves, Mr. Cubit Nichols being architect for one part and Messrs. Archer & Green for another, and every care was taken that the sanitary arrangements should be as perfect as possible. Lyons also stated, "That there were eight workshops in each house;" as there are four houses, this would make a total of 32 shops. He further states that each workshop contains from 20 to 30 hands.

This would make the number of hands employed 640 to 960. I would ask your Lordships to notice the difference between those statements and the facts, as upon these statements hangs the whole pith of his remarks regarding the sanitary arrangements for the premises. The facts are these: The four houses are divided into 15 shops only, and not 32. The hands in each shop average about 14, and not 20 to 30; or a total of about 210 instead of 640 to 960. I need not point out to your Lordships that what would appear insufficient sanitary arrangements for 640 to 960 people might be ample for about 200. Your Lordships will not fail to observe, how this man, to create a prejudice against our house and its sanitary arrangements, not only more than doubles the number of workshops, but actually quadruples the number of workpeople employed in them. The actual sanitary arrangements for the 15 shops are as follows: For the women there are four closets and four lavatories; for the men there are four closets, and four urinals, and four lavatories. This accommodation has always been amply sufficient, and it is properly divided among the different houses. Lyons stated that for these eight rooms in each house there are only two closets; that the w.c.'s for the males are right below the house, in the cellars, that the one for the females is in the centre of the house, and that there are only two for the whole eight rooms. Those are his words. Now, the only house that has a man's closet, &c., in the basement has a women's lavatory and closet built out on the yard on the first floor. This house contains three rooms only, and not eight, as sworn to by the witness; and I venture to say it would be difficult, in designing a new house, to better arrange the sanitary accommodation. In our other houses the closets and lavatories are either at the top of the house, or on each floor built out at the back. Everything that is possible is done to keep things in proper order. A man is employed solely to look after these shops and the sanitary arrangements to them. We have a direct supply of drinking water coming from the main, without passing through a cistern, and during hot weather all the shops are supplied with ice and lemons free of cost. No expense has been spared to render the workshops perfect in every respect. The walls and ceilings are distempered and whitened every year. The shops have been repeatedly passed by Her Majesty's Factory Inspectors, who have always spoken most highly of the general arrangements. I should take it as a great favour if any of your Lordships would visit the premises, and see the condition they are in, and the arrangements made for the comfort of the workpeople. The witness in this part of his evidence states: "These workshops are let out to sweaters by Nicoll, and Nicoll charges these sweaters rent." As he again repeats this statement in greater detail further on, I purpose dealing with it when I come to that part of the evidence, contenting myself for the moment with assuring your Lordships that it is absolutely untrue. The workpeople in all the shops are paid wages, reckoned at so much per hour or day. This is the custom in the tailoring trade. In 11 out of the 15 shops, the captains or foremen are weekly servants (the workpeople are engaged by the hour or day). They have all been appointed by myself. They engage and agree the rate of wage with the workers in their separate rooms. The captains, however, have nothing whatever to do with paying wages, which is done by cashiers from our counting-house, who pay each worker individually. In four of the rooms we do not pay the workers ourselves, but pay so much per garment to the foreman of the room, who engages and agrees the rate of wage with the workers, in a similar way that the foremen of the 11 other shops do. I would here make a little comment; because these four shops take a different course to the others. They were men who, two of them at least, had worked for the firm for 30 years, and when these shops were newly built, we preferred that they should come in and bring their staff with them rather than work in their own houses where they lived. Although we are not so closely in contact with the workpeople here, as in the other case, I can prove to your Lordships' satisfaction that they receive as good weekly pay as those hands paid by our own cashiers. I would also state that all our foremen are good practical working tailors, who first commenced with us as ordinary journeymen, but, through long service and steadiness, have been promoted to their present position. Some of these men are here, also some of their

their workpeople, that your Lordships may, if you so wish, question them on any point on which you may require information. I have also here the wages book for your inspection, showing separately the wages paid in each workshop, and the amount against each person's name. I would point out that it is quite impossible to obtain workpeople capable of doing our class of work except at a high rate of wages. Lyons stated that the average earnings of the men were 18*s.* per week. In contradiction to this statement, I took out the wages of every man employed in all the 15 shops for the week which ended on the day Lyons gave his evidence, and find the average pay each man received for that week was 47*s.* 6*d.*, some received more and some received less, but I do not suppose there was any man in the shop who earned less than two guineas a week, and some as high as 65*s.* a week.

9689. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] The average was 47 *s.* 6 *d.* a week, you say?
Yes.

9690. And two guineas the lowest?
Yes.

9691. And 65 *s.* the highest?
Yes.

9692. And what were those men doing?
Tailoring, doing sewing, making ladies' goods and gentlemen's goods.

9693. Not any special part?
No.

9694. Lord *Sandhurst.*] Are there no women included in that?
Not in that rate of wages. With regard to the women engaged in that special week, I took out their rates of wages, and they averaged 19 *s.* a week all round. And then the season was not exactly commenced; later on the men earned rather more than less, and the women would earn more.

9695. *Chairman.*] That is to say, you have taken the total number of men employed, and the total number of women employed, and then taken the average?
Yes.

9696. Earl of *Derby.*] Would they earn those wages all through the year?
With very few exceptions. We have very little slack time indeed. Some of the men will speak, if you like to examine them, as to the slack time we get; perhaps five or six weeks in the year, not more. It is difficult to understand how the witness could appear before your Lordships and make such a deliberate false statement as this is. He must know that it is always difficult to get good men at the West-end, even at wages varying from 45 *s.* to 50 *s.* a week. Lyons then proceeds to formulate a charge against our house which I can only describe as an infamous one. He states, in effect, that we evade all the consequences of breaking the law, contained in the Factory Acts, by letting off our workshops to others. With your Lordship's permission, I will read this part of his evidence, and the replies he made to your questions. His words are: "What I should say to Nicoll is: 'Here are the men on your own premises; dispense with the middleman sweater, because if he was dispensed with and you came in contact with the workers directly, they would be able to work shorter hours, and they would have better sanitation'; because, as the workshop is let out to the sweater, it takes all the responsibility off Nicoll altogether." It appears to me that your Lordships from the first doubted the correctness of this statement, because I find the Earl of Onslow put this question to the witness: "Do you say, as a fact, that Messrs. Nicoll do throw all responsibility off themselves on to the sweater?" to which the witness replied, "I say it is so, as a fact, because the sweater pays the rent." Still, your Lordships did not appear satisfied; for the noble Chairman put the question: "I suppose you do not mean to say that you know of your own knowledge that Nicolls have thrown the responsibility on the sweater; but what you mean is that you assume that they would under the

the circumstances of the case?" His answer to the Chairman was: "It is so, because they throw all responsibility on this man; they have nothing at all to do with the workers; they charge the rent to this man and give him the work; they build up their premises and hire them out, so as to get the name that the work is done inside the premises, instead of off the premises;" and further on he says, "I take it that he throws all the responsibility on to the sweater, because the sweater signs his name, instead of Nicoll himself; and if your Lordships will visit these places, if there are rules at all . . . you will find that the sweater's name is signed on these rules, instead of Nicoll's." I have brought one of the boards that is hung up in the factory, in the entrance to the shops (*producing a board*). You see it is signed by myself. Here is another board, showing the exceptional hours that we take; instead of six to six, we take eight to eight.

9697. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury*.] These are what hang in your shop? I have had them taken down purposely.

9698. *Chairman*.] Is there one of these boards in each house?
In each entrance. There are three entrances to the shops, and this appears at the entrance from the street.

9699. They are not in the work-rooms themselves, but in the entrance?
In the entrance, so that everyone who passes can see it.

9700. Earl of *Limerick*.] Does that apply to all the houses?
Yes. One is a double house.

9701. In none of the houses are there boards in the names of persons other than of your firm?
None but mine; I have always signed them and no one else. You see the statement is a direct falsehoood; I say the whole of this evidence is a deliberate lie in every particular.

9702. *Chairman*.] How do you know that what the witness meant by rules are these regulations that you have shown us on the boards?
These are the rules, the factory rules that apply to all workshops.

9703. You are sure that is what he meant by rules?
Yes, there can be no others. The whole of this evidence is a deliberate lie in every particular. We have never let, nor received rent for any workshop. The conditions of the Factory Acts are carried out by ourselves, and the only signature on the Factory Act notice is, and always has been, my own. I have produced the board, and you have seen that it was signed by myself in 1881. Lyons stated that our hours were from seven to nine. You will see by the notices that they are from eight to eight. No female is allowed on the premises before or after that time, and the shops are closed at three o'clock on Saturdays. With reference to the small amount of goods not manufactured here, and referred to by Lyons at the commencement of his evidence, these goods are for the wholesale trade in the provinces and for export; these are the goods that are made in the East-end. Lyons stated that the prices we pay for making these goods are much higher than those of any other house in the trade, and I think this is about the only statement in his evidence that is not untrue. We do not attempt to do the cheaper trade, and as a result of the continued demand for low-priced goods on the part of the public, our wholesale trade has become so reduced that we now employ five persons only in the East-end. Their workshops are all passed by Her Majesty's Inspector; we keep constant supervision over them, and the Factory Acts are properly observed. I took out the wages for every man employed in these shops for the week Lyons gave his evidence, and found the average was 43 *s.* 9 *d.* per man. We do not get much slack time in the year, so that your Lordships can judge whether these workmen are ill-paid or not. I think I have now met all the accusations brought against my firm. To one and all I have given the most unqualified contradiction. A summary of the evidence shows the following results. The witness says the shops were formerly dwelling-houses; I say that they were not, but that they are

are houses built purposely for workshops. He says that in each house there are eight workshops; I say there are only four. He says there are 32 workshops in all; I say there are only 15. He says there are 20 to 30 hands in each shop; I say there are only 14. He says there are 640 to 960 hands in all; I say that there are about 200. He says there are two closets for every eight rooms; I say there are two for every four rooms. He says that all the men's closets are below in the cellar; I say that only one out of the four is in the cellar. He says the workshops are let; I deny it. He says the occupiers pay rent; I say it is a lie. He says the sweater signed the rules; I deny it. He says the hours are from seven to nine; I say they are from eight to eight. He says the average earnings they make are 18*s.* a week; I say they are 47*s.* 6*d.* The only statement in which I agree with him is where he says that we pay higher wages than any other house for made goods. I maintain that in the West-end our men can earn more money than in any other house in the West-end. If there are any questions your Lordships would like to put to me, I am here to answer them.

9704. You say that you employ five persons to make for you in the East-end?
Five persons. One of them I have brought here that you might examine him.

9705. And that their workshops have been passed by Her Majesty's Inspectors?
Yes. We sent round the names of the five shops to Her Majesty's Inspector, and requested that special care and attention would be paid to these shops. Lyons stated that one of the men last year was fined 25 *l.*; but, on reference to the man, I find that the fine was inflicted in 1883, since which time there has been no accusation brought against either shop.

9706. What was he fined for, do you know?
I believe he had a wedding in the house, and there was some little neglect or something in closing the shop. His daughter was married; that was the explanation he gave to me.

9707. Lord *Sandhurst.*] Was he working for you at that time?
He was, and has worked for us ever since.

9708. *Chairman.*] Are there no rules ever put up besides those you have shown to the Committee?
No others.

9709. Are there no others that apply to the workshops?
No.

9710. I understand you that the foremen are paid by the firm?
Yes.

9711. And that they settle the wages with the men under them?
Yes; but they do not pay the wages.

9712. But you have nothing to do with the settlement of what the wages are to be?
No; but the foremen, who are of the same trade, are not likely to reduce the wages if they can help it to their fellow-men, I can assure you, rather the reverse.

9713. And you do not charge anything for rent whatever?
Never a farthing has been paid for rent under any circumstances whatever.

9714. Or do you deduct anything from their weekly wages?
Nothing whatever. It is as foul a lie as ever was uttered by anyone.

9715. Do you include in the number of workmen you gave to the Committee the clerks and salesmen?
No; those are a special class; we reckon those at about 200.

9716. Are they included in the number you gave?
No, they are not.

9717. The part of your business that is done in the East-end has very much diminished, I understand you?
It is simply such things as are sold by retail dealers in the country, and for export.

9718. It is very much diminished?
Very much. Unless we competed with some of the City houses, we could not possibly carry on a wholesale trade. Some years ago we had a large wholesale trade, when the competition was not so keen, and our name was known all over the country for first-class goods; but unless we had gone into competition and reduced the price of making, we could not have competed with other houses; and rather than do that we gave it up.

9719. Do you employ many foreign tailors in the house?
Yes, we do, a good many. I had an analysis taken only yesterday, thinking the question would be put to me, and I find that the workpeople range about five to four; there are about five Englishmen to four foreigners.

9720. What are the foreigners; Germans?
Germans; Irishmen.

9721. You do not call Irishmen foreigners, do you?
No; I was giving you an outline of the workmen. We have Germans, occasionally French; not many.

9722. And as to the ground upon which you built these workshops, what was it occupied by?
They were dwelling-houses before they were re-built.

9723. Did you pull them down?
Yes, excepting three rooms which I specified, which were over the counting-house; they were not disturbed.

9724. Lord *Sandhurst.*] You say that you have 200 hands in your workshops?
About 200; 210, when I took the number.

9725. Then you mentioned 200 salesmen and others?
That is in the different houses.

9726. But those are not in those workshops?
No; that is a distinct matter; they are cutters and fitters, and clerks and salesmen; in fact, the different employés necessary to carry on the business.

9727. I suppose some of your employés stay with you a very long time?
A great many. We have a great many salesmen and clerks that have been with us over 30 years.

9728. And workers, too?
Yes. I think another of your Lordships here, as well as yourself, have seen hands that have been in our employ over 30 years, in the workshop only.

9729. Have you not a room given up to one family as a workshop?
Yes; they have worked for us for 20 years; a man and his two daughters, and his wife.

9730. That is in this Warwick-street establishment?
Yes.

9731. And, then, have you not got some system of pensions that you give to your servants?
When men are away ill, their salaries are generally continued to them. We have a club in the house; there is a subscription of so much per week from each employé, and in case of illness they draw according to their position.

9732. Earl

9732. Earl of *Limerick.*] I think you said you had got the pay-lists; can you put them in?

(*The Witness produces them.*) I have the wages book here; perhaps you would like to see it; it has been in continuation for years (*handing the wages book to his Lordship*).

9733. Could you tell us what the highest average is in the busiest times?

I should say they would be all then on full time, and then the wages would average about 50 *s.* a week.

9734. And the lowest, in the slackest times?

We could hardly tell that. Tailors expect during the slack season a little falling off in the trade; but it is quite an impossibility to detain them in the shops; they migrate.

9735. One page here is headed: "Saturday, 7 July 1888. Wheatley's workrooms," and then there are the names of the workers in that shop; one is put down 50 *s.*; another, 50 *s.*; another, 45 *s.*; another, 37 *s.*; another, 48 *s.*; another, 24 *s.*; another, 24 *s.*; another, 26 *s.*; and there are a number of other names going down to 22 *s.*, 15 *s.*, 20 *s.*, 16 *s.*, 13 *s.*, 9 *s.*, and then there is the captain, 65 *s.*; what causes those variations in wages?

Those are men where the larger amounts are; directly you get to the smaller, 24 *s.*, they are women, and this 9 *s.* person is a girl, kept to run about only.

9736. Jones, 13 *s.*; what is that?

She was formerly an errand girl at 9 *s.* a week, and then got promoted to 13 *s.*

9377. Now Salter at 26 *s.*; is that a woman?

Yes.

9738. Then underneath that there are no names but certain numbers with wages put against them underneath; what are they?

That is the check number that goes out with the garment. For that garment they are paid 23 *s.*

9739. Is that partially piece-work?

No; we keep an account of the goods that go into the shop so that we can compare it with the amount paid. In some of the shops it goes out as piece-work, and we are enabled to compare the piece-work shops with the day-work shops.

9740. Now there is another shop, "Lanes' work-room"?

That is absolutely a woman's room, where women make skirts.

9741. There is Lane, 63 *s.*?

She is the forewoman of the room.

9742. Livingstone, 45 *s.*?

He is the presser; that is the only man in the room.

9743. There is one I see; Best, 8 *s.* 9 *d.*; what would that be?

She is the errand girl, I expect. In the skirt-room some of them may be on short time.

9744. Burton, 14 *s.* 2 *d.*?

That woman's wages are generally about 19 *s.* or 20 *s.*; the skirt-room are not always fully employed.

9745. There is one here, 6 *s.* 8 *d.*?

She is an errand girl.

9746. The range of the wages seems to vary?

The skirt-room is cheapest. If you take the next room, Newman's room; he is a witness who is here now.

9747. In making out that average of women's wages which you gave us, what did you include; did you include those girls?

Yes, all; every one.

9748. And that works out, you say, at 19 *s.* per week?
Yes, that was that special week. Many of the women's wages average 24 *s.* or 26 *s.*, others are less; and putting them together and dividing them they come out at 19 *s.* a head.

9749. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Is it not possible that any people working in the shop might have been ignorant that it was your signature that was at the bottom of these notices which are required by the Factory Act?
They must have known it was my name; they may not have recognised the handwriting.

9750. But you think they could not have mistaken the name for that of somebody else?
No, they could not.

9751. Lord *Monkswell.*] I think you said you had about 700 workpeople; how do you account for 700; you say you have a little over 200 employed in the 15 workshops, and 200 employed in the shop itself?
We have a large house at Manchester, one at Cornhill, one at Birmingham, and one at Liverpool.

9752. And are they all conducted on the same principle?
On the same principle.

9753. Very little work is done outside the shop?
Very little.

9754. The women employed are all English, I suppose?
Pretty nearly.

9755. About overtime: Do the women ever work overtime?
Never.

9756. And the men?
Occasionally they do. They may wait a little late sometimes, but the house is absolutely closed up at nine o'clock, and it is seldom that the men work after eight.

9757. Do you give notice to the Factory Inspector that you employ men who take shops under you?
I consulted the Factory Inspector about it; I wished to know whether we were to hold ourselves liable for the proper carrying out of the Factory Acts in those workshops. He said, yes; we could not shake off the responsibility.

9758. And, although in those shops, as between you and the men employed by you at the head of the shop, the system of piece-work prevails, still he in paying his workmen, pays them not by the piece, but by the day?
Yes, just the same system is pursued exactly as in our own shops, and I have reason to believe that they get higher wages in those shops than they do in our own.

9759. And do you find that there is any difference in your profits between the shops where you employ, what might be called, middle-men and the shops which are directly under your supervision?
Very little; sometimes some of them will come out a little better and others a little worse. The difference arises in this way. The men who have charge of our own shops, where we pay the workpeople ourselves, spend a great deal of time in the business of getting the work together; and we reckon that if, on an average, we lose 20 *s.* or 30 *s.* a week by each shop where the men are employed on day-work, we are quite content.

9760. And in the other shops you do not lose anything; you make your own bargain?
Just so. I can say this, that if anything the work is much better done by day workers than by the other workers; there is no interest on their part in pushing the trade through.

9761. Earl

9761. Earl of *Limerick.*] What is the description of work done in Truss's workroom?
It is a skirt-room; a women's room.

9762. Is that some of the lowest paid description of labour?
Always; skirt hands are the lowest paid.

9763. Taking one week, I see that the wages were 19 s., 15 *s.*, 9 *s.* 8 *d.*, 14 *s.*, 14 s. 6 *d.*, 10 *s.* 6 *d.* 16 s., and 15 *s.*; then 9 s., 6 *s.*, and Truss 37 *s.* 6 *d.*?
Yes; she is the forewoman. You see, sometimes the work is not full enough to occupy them the whole day, or they were away for a day's holiday.

9764. I see, taking them on four different occasions throughout the book, the wages in that room appear to be generally low?
The wages of the skirt-rooms are always low; they are the two lowest paid rooms that we have in the house.

9765. Is it less skilled labour?
Yes.

9766. *Chairman.*] The foremen's wages, I suppose, go into the average of the men's wages?
Yes.

9767. They would be a little higher?
They vary from 55 *s.* to 65 *s.* When a man is first promoted to be captain of a room, his wages are put down at 55 *s.*, and if he remains years in that capacity, the higher amount is the amount paid to him weekly.

9768. Does anything exist in the way of men working overtime without being paid for it?
No.

9769. If the men are paid by time, are they supposed to do a certain amount of work in that time?
No. If men work improperly, and their work is sent back to them, their pay is not stopped; they receive full money at the end of the week.

9770. The foreman settles the rate of wages, but not also the amount of work to be done for them?
No; you may trust him not to force the men. We look to the foreman to see that the work is turned out well; that it is properly done, irrespective of quantity. Our customers lie amongst the best class of people in London, I may say.

9771. Would you know if men had worked overtime without being paid; that is to say, if they had been credited with half a day's work, and had really worked a whole day?
I should not know it; but I will put the foremen before you, and you can question them themselves. They would have no interest in stopping the men's wages; none whatever.

9772. Lord *Sandhurst.*] You admitted just now to the Chairman that the foremen's wages were included in the average?
Yes.

9773. But then, at the same time, there are a certain number of errand girls who receive very low wages?
Yes.

9774. And they pull the average of the women's wages down in a corresponding degree?
Yes, in a greatly increased ratio.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

16*th July* 1888.

EDMUND WHEATLEY, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

9775. *Chairman.*] You are the foreman or captain of one of the shops of Messrs. Nicoll?
am captain of one of the shops.

9776. Which shop?
No. 5, Warwick-street.

9777. What is the nature of the work carried on there?
Ladies' costumes.

9778. And how many hands are employed in your shop?
Fifteen in all.

9779. Men and women?
Yes.

9780. Can you tell us how many men and how many women?
I have six men and seven women, including an errand girl.

9781. How do you fix the rate of wages?
There are two hands who get 50 *s.* a-week.

9782. I was not asking you how much they get, but how do you arrange what they are to get?
According to their ability; I have to judge first what they can do.

9783. Supposing a new hand comes to you, how do you settle the wages to be paid to that person?
I agree to give him, perhaps, 45 *s.* a-week; of course if he suits I give him more.

9784. You would begin by giving him 45 *s.*?
Forty-five shillings a-week; that is the least that is paid there.

9785. And if he proves to be a good workman?
If he proves to be a good workman I raise his wages to 2 *l.* 7 *s.* or 2 *l.* 10 *s.*

9786. And in the case of women, what do you begin at?
Twenty-six shillings is the most we pay them.

9787. And what would be the least?
The errand girl gets 9 *s.* a-week.

9788. And you would increase their wages on the same system as with the men?
Yes. The errand girl that I had a short time ago, I put her on to work at sewing now, like an apprentice; she had 9 *s.* a-week when she started, and now she is getting 13 *s.*

9789. What time do you begin work in the morning?
Eight o'clock.

9790. What time do you close the shop?
Eight o'clock.

9791. How long do you allow for meals?
One hour for dinner and half an hour for tea.

9792. Have you heard the evidence given by Mr. Sheppard?
Yes.

9793. And do you agree with it generally?
Yes.

9794. Have

9794. Have you any remark upon it that you wish to make?
I think that I have one man here who has been working for me for five years; he gets 50 *s.* per week; I think he is pretty well paid.

9795. Earl of *Limerick.*] You are paid a weekly wage?
Yes, I get 3 *l.* 5 *s.* a week. When I started on the firm seven years ago, I started at two guineas, and I have been raised gradually since.

9796. You have got no pecuniary interest whatever, have you, in the amount of wages paid to the workpeople under you?
Not in the least.

9797. In speaking of the wages paid, I understood you were alluding to the wages paid in your own room?
Yes; I do not know anything about any other rooms.

9798. When you said that the lowest wage paid was to the errand girl, 9 *s.*; that is as regards your own room?
Yes.

9799. Because I notice that they are lower in some other rooms?
I cannot speak for any other room than my own.

9800. I suppose the hands are paid so much an hour?
Yes, so much an hour.

9801. And are they employed constantly during the six days in the week?
In January and February there comes a slack time; they cannot find full employment then.

9802. How many days a week do you suppose they make in January and February?
Four and a half days.

9803. With the exception of these two months are they working six days a week all the year round?
Pretty well all the year round; I have my books of the wages in my pocket.

9804. Lord *Sandhurst.*] I suppose you assert that what is generally known as sweating in the tailoring trade is absolutely unknown by you at Messrs. Nicoll's?
I do not know any sweaters.

9805. *Chairmnn.*] Do you commence and complete the work done in your room; is it all done in your room, the whole thing?
Yes.

9806. From beginning to end?
Yes.

9807. Under your supervision?
Yes; it is all ladies' costumes that we make.

9808. Do you consider the sanitary arrangements satisfactory?
Very good indeed; they are very good workshops.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MISS ADELAIDE SALTER, is called in; and having been sworn; is Examined, as follows:

9809. *Chairman.*] WHAT shop are you employed in?
Mr. Wheatley's, No. 5.

9810. Have you heard Mr. Wheatley's evidence.
Yes.

9811. Do you agree with it?
I know it is true.

9812. You have nothing to say about it?
No.

9813. Have you anything to add; anything that you wish to say to the Committee in addition to what Mr. Wheatley said?
No, I did not come up as a witness; I merely came up if I were required.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

IGNAC POSWA, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

9814. *Chairman.*] You are employed by Messrs. Nicolls & Company.
Yes.

9815. In what capacity?
In No. 12 room, 41 Warwick-street.

9816. Are you called a foreman?
A foreman.

9817. How many hands are employed in your shop?
I have got 15 hands at present.

9818. How many men?
Six men and nine women.

9819. Do engage these hands yourself?
Yes.

9820. How are they paid?
Weekly wages; I pay on Saturday, once a week.

9821. So much a week, or so much an hour?
So much an hour, and so much a day.

9822. And how is the rate of wages settled?
To the worst man I pay 2 *l.* 5 *s.* a week, and to the best man I pay 2 *l.* 17 *s.* a week.

9823. For how many hours?
From eight to eight.

9824. For six days?
For six days.

9825. What time do you close on Saturday?
At three o'clock.

9826 That makes five and a half days?
We reckon it six days.

9827. How do you arrange the wages they are to get; do you judge of the man's excellence?
Yes; I engage a man, and I see if he is a good man, and then I give him the wages. If I see he is not good, I send him away; we do not employ bad men, only good, in Messrs. Nicholls.

9828. Do you have any disputes?
No.

9829. Lord *Clinton.*] Do you work yourself?
Yes, I work very hard.

9830. Have you the whole of the work done in the room?
Yes.

9831. Is

9831. Is it a ladies' room?
Yes, for ladies' jackets, ulsters, any kind of ladies' garments.

9832. No work is put out by you?
No.

9833. Earl of *Limerick.*] You pay the workmen and workwomen who are in the room yourself?
Yes.

9834. It is different from the arrangement in the room of the Witness before last?
Yes, it is different.

9835. *Chairman.*] Do men get a certain job to do at a certain price, and do you settle the wages that the men are to get, or how do you manage; I do not quite understand?
I am what we call a piecemaker; there are so many pieces, and I get so much of it. A lady's bodice, fancy braided, we get 35 *s.* 3 *d.* for.

9836. You get certain work to do, and you get a certain price for doing it in the shop?
Yes.

9837. That goes to you?
Yes; we divide it between ourselves; it does not go only to me, because I have 14 in the work-room.

9838. But you pay the men out of that, I mean?
Yes.

9839. And you have to settle your rate of wages by considering the quantity of work that the men can do and also according to the price that you get for the work when done?
Yes.

9840. How long have you been in the employment of Messrs. Nicoll?
Eight years.

9841. Has the rate of wages gone up or down?
It is going up.

9842. Is the price you get going up too.
Yes.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. BARNETT MARCUS, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

9843. *Chairman.*] WHAT is your business?
I am a tailor, at 37, Conduit-street.

9844. What class of tailoring work do you do?
Ladies' work.

9845. Altogether ladies' work?
Only ladies' work.

9846. All bespoke work?
Yes, all bespoke work.

9847. Is all your work done on your own premises?
All my work is done on the premises.

9848. How many hands do you employ?
Altogether, men and females, I should think about thirty.

9849. And did you ever work for Mr. Benjamin?
I did.

9850. Have you read the evidence that was given before the Committee by Wilchenski in which your firm was mentioned?
Yes.

9851. Have you anything to say to that?
I wish to contradict everything said about me. I am a practical tailor myself, and learnt the cutting practically right through, and I do all the cutting myself, and do all the fitting myself.

9852. Do you know what he said about you?
He said I was a sweater for Mr. Benjamin, I certainly did work for Mr. Benjamin himself for from five to five and a half years, and I used to do the best work there.

9853. He says here, as is stated in his evidence, that you employ Polish Jews; is that so?
No, not entirely; I employ all classes; I make no distinction of creed, and I pay them all the same wages. If a man is a good man, it does not matter to me what he is. I pay him good wages.

9854. In the same answer, the Witness says, speaking of you, "He does not give the work out; he has it made in the back of his premises, in a yard at the back of Conduit-street;" is that the case?
That is right.

9855. "He pays them prices, some of them working piece-work, much below the price he could afford to pay for the prices he charges the ladies, and much below the prices paid by other firms." Do your men work piece-work?
No, they do not; all my men work week-work; they get so much a week.

9856. All of them?
All of them.

9857. Do you consider that you pay them "much below" the rate of wages "paid by other firms"?
I consider that the men I employ get more wages than they could get in any shop right throughout the United Kingdom.

9858. Can you give the Committee their average rate of wages?
I do not employ them unless they are good, and I pay them 3 *l.* a-week; and I make no stoppages for any holidays whatever. In summer Jewish people have many holidays, and I make no stoppages for them, right through.

9859. £. 3 a-week, you say, you pay the men?
£. 3 a-week.

9860. How many women have you?
The button-hole hands I pay 30 *s.* a-week, the same as the others; there are none of them below 16 *s.* a-week. I do not employ many women at all.

9861. The lowest get 16 *s.* a-week, you say?
Yes.

9862. At any time of the year?
At any time of the year; I have no slack time whatever.

9863. And what is the lowest for men?
There is only one man in my employment, who gets 36 *s.* a week, and he gets paid for all holidays.

9864. And you employ about 30 hands?
Yes.

9865. Do you employ them all the year round?
All the year round.

9866. No slack time?
No slack time whatever.

9867. I forget

9867. I forget whether you told me how many men you employ?
Altogether I should think there are about 16 men.

9868. Sixteen men and 14 women?
Yes.

9869. Do the men and women work together?
The females who make the skirts have a room entirely to themselves.

9870. Do all the women work by themselves?
Yes.

9871. And the men work by themselves?
And the men work in one room, a very large room; and only those young women who make the button-holes and do the felling are in the same room as the men; but they do not sit together, they sit entirely separate.

9872. Do you think that the two sexes working together leads to immorality?
I do not think so.

9873. How many hours a day do the men work?
The men are supposed to come in at eight, but they do not come in until half-past eight, and they leave off at half-past eight. The females should come in at half-past eight, but they do not come in until a quarter to nine or nine, and I make no stoppages though they leave off punctually at eight; in fact, five minutes before.

9874. How much time do you allow them for meals?
One hour for dinner and half-an-hour for tea.

9875. Lord *Clinton.*] When you were working for Mr. Benjamin did you work in his shop?
No, I did not.

9876. Where were you working then?
I was living at 13, Frith-street, Soho.

9877. Was that your private house?
It used to be my private house.

9878. When you worked in your private house, how many did you employ there?
I never employed more than four men and about three young women, and I worked myself.

9879. What rooms did your house contain?
The house contained 12 rooms, but I had a large workshop; the workroom where I used to do my work used to be at the back. It was, I should think, 70 feet long and about 30 feet wide.

9880. You had a workshop?
Yes.

9881. And did men and women work in it?
Yes.

9882. Was it inspected by the inspector?
Yes.

9883. By what inspector?
By the Government inspector.

9884. Was any fault ever found with it?
There never was any fault to be found with my place; and the Government inspector has also visited my present place, and has never found any fault. It is beautifully lofty and very large. The workrooms which my people work in now the landlord estimated 200 *l.* a year for. When I took the premises, the shop, and

and the adjoining workshops, I did not like to give such a high rent, and the landlord said he could let the workshops for 200 *l.* a year.

9885. I understood you to say that when working with Mr. Benjamin you had a factory?
A workshop.

9886. And all the work was done there?
All the work was done there.

9887. Earl of *Limerick.*] Have you got separate water-closets for the men and women?
Yes, I have got one room which I was offered 25 *l.* a year for, but I made it a convenience for the men and women.

9888. Are the water-closets for the men and women separate?
Entirely separate.

9889. Is there a lavatory?
Yes; and I have every convenience for them, everything they like; I have everything done. I do not employ any foreman to engage them; I engage all my men myself; and I see to all the work, cut out all the work and fit it.

9890. Are the water-closets in the basement?
On the ground floor.

9891. And the men and women apart?
Quite apart. I have brought some of the work to show your Lordships, because it was said that the work at my place was done by females.

9892. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] Are your people regular in coming in the morning to work?
Yes, my people come regularly.

9893. So that you do not lose much in that way?
If I do lose anything, I never deduct anything, because sometimes they say they lost a 'bus and so on; and, having been a practical man myself, I know, it is very hard on poor people to lose any time. None of my female hands ever come in before ten minutes to nine.

9894. What time ought they to be there?
At half-past eight.

9895. Then you must lose a good deal by that; 20 minutes for each woman.
If I was to reckon it up, I loose a good deal over the year.

9896. But you say your practice is not to make deductions for that?
Everyone of my hands could be examined; I never make any stoppages; in fact, they get all paid. Females have stopped away for a day's illness, and come back and said they were ill, and I never allowed any stoppages whatever.

9887*. Lord *Monkswell.*] You do not take it off from their meal times?
No, they never stop in my place for meals.

9888*. You say you pay 30 *s.* for button-holers; have the button-holers to find their own gimp and twist out of that?
No, I find everything.

9889*. Lord *Clinton.*] What is the value of it?
I could not say, because we buy it in large quantities. I have a regular man from Leek who supplies me with silks and the rest. I sometimes find twist and different things, which the workpeople have used, thrown about; of course, as it does not cost them anything they do not take so much interest in it; but, as we do a regular trade, we could not be so particular. They always come down to the shop for everything, because it is adjoining the place.

9890*. Earl of *Limerick.*] Would you estimate the gimp and twist at 4 *s.* to a pound's wages?

I should

I should think it would be possible; it all depends upon what they get paid.

9891*. At the rate of a halfpenny a button-hole, for instance?
I do not see how they could get any living at all at a halfpenny a button-hole; they would have to work 16 or 18 hours a day to get decent wages; we do not reckon in that way.

9892*. How many button-holes can a good hand do?
For a good hand she ought to make eight button-holes an hour; she can make more, but they would not be good.

9893*. What would you consider the average?
Taking what I have made on the premises in the bodices, I once went into the matter, and I never could get more than eight button-holes an hour from any female. I have seen in the papers that they say they can make 10 or 12 button-holes of the coat size. I do not think it is possible they could be strong, or could wear more than a week; they could not be fastened off properly.

9894*. *Chairman.*] How long have you been established in Conduit-street?
About eight years.

9895*. Have you changed your mode of doing business at all; do you employ more women now?
I never employed any of them whatever to make my garments, only for the skirts and button-holes; but all the garments are made by the most practical men I can find.

9896*. Earl of *Limerick.*] Do you think that a woman could keep up working at the rate of making four button-holes in 13½ minutes?
That I could not say; if she did, she would have to go like an engine.

9897. Would you be surprised to hear that a women did that before this Committee?
I should. A button-hole ought to be fastened up at the corner; when a button-hole is worked improperly, it breaks off; the twist and gimp and everything hangs out at the corners.

9898. *Chairman.*] I asked you whether you employed more women now in proportion to the men than when you began business?
I always employed men in preference to women.

9899. Do you employ more women now in proportion to men?
Yes, I do, and men too.

9900. Earl of *Limerick.*] You mean more of both?
More of both.

9901. *Chairman.*] I ask you whether you employ more women in proportion to the number of men you employ?
No, I do not.

9902. You employ now about 16 men and 14 women, you have told us?
Yes, and out of that 14 women there are nine who are in the skirt-room entirely by themselves, who make the skirts.

9903. You say that the whole of the bodice is done by men?
All the bodices are done by men.

9904. Every bit of it?
Every bit of it, except the button-holes.

9905. I will read you what was said at Question 4000. The question put to Mr. Wilchinski was, "Will you explain how a bodice is made; what part of it is done by men, and what part by women?" and his answer was, "Generally speaking, the skilful part is done by men." Then he was asked, "What is the skilful part," and he says, "Putting the bodice together properly, so that it does

not twist, and that the seams of the back go straight; that requires a little skill; and then shaping the collar; that is the most particular part. When a lady has a little collar like that on a riding habit, it requires some skill to make a little collar and turn, and the men put in the canvas in the bodice or jacket, French canvas put inside to make it solid, stiff, substantial; it must be put in very skilfully to look nice and fit, and then they turn in all the edges and make the pockets; and then, afterwards, it is given to a girl who will put on tape on the seams for the whalebones to go in, and the lining, in most cases, is put in by men; it can be done by women. The lining is tacked in by women, and the lining is felled, sewn all round. If there was a girl working in a room they would not give that to a man to do; the girl would do it, and all the other kind of sewing like, and do the padding." Is that a correct description of the way in which bodices are made?

Not all; some parts are correct, but most of it is not. If a man is a careful man he would not trust to a woman to put on the tape. It has been stated that my work is all done by females, and so I have brought two garments for you to judge whether it is possible that any female in the United Kingdom could do such work (*producing two garments*).

9906. Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury.*] You consider that no woman could do that work?

No woman could do it.

9907. Why?

If they were to do it, it would not be done properly. Any garment shaped out like this (*pointing*) could not be done by a female.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Jovis, 19° *Julii,* 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of ONSLOW.
Lord CLINTON.
Lord FOXFORD (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord MONKSWELL.
Lord THRING.

LORD KENRY (EARL OF DUNRAVEN AND MOUNT-EARL), IN THE CHAIR.

MR. JOHN ARTHUR CRAIG, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

9908. *Chairman.*] YOU are the Secretary of the Boot and Shoe Manufacturers' Association and Leather Trades' Protection Society?
I am.

9909. Will you tell the Committee what are the objects of the society?
The association originated in the autumn of 1881, and received its license of incorporation from the Board of Trade on the 22nd September 1882, under Section 23 of the Companies Act, 1867. The objects of the association are: First, the federation of the whole of the members for the promotion of the general interests of the trade; secondly, the due representation of its interest in all questions of importance to the trade; thirdly, the effecting of a clear union between capital and labour, and the prevention of strikes; and lastly, the formation of a mutual trades' protection society, devoted exclusively to the special trades and for the sole use of members. Its membership numbers nearly 350, and includes most of the largest and most important boot and shoe manufacturers of London.

9910. Are the members confined to persons manufacturing in London?
No, not entirely so. There are manufacturers who have branches, and there are some who solely have their places in Northampton or Leicester, or Stafford, or other centres of the boot and shoe manufacture.

9911. Do you know how many of the members are manufacturers in London?
About 250.

9912. Do you know at all the total number of boot and shoe manufacturers in London?
I propose with your Lordship's permission to read a statement, and I would give that in my statement.

9913. Will you tell the number now, if you know it?
Just over 400.

9914. Will you make any statement to the Committee that you desire?
The existence of the sweating system in connection with the boot trade is not a new thing to my committee. It was, in fact, the subject of a special and representative meeting of the trade called by the committee, and held the 13th April 1886, when Mr. F. S. Miers, a member of the committee, who has been examined by your Lordships, read a paper dealing with the subject. The following resolution was unanimously passed at that meeting: "That, in the opinion of this meeting, the sweating system does exist in the London boot trade, and that this association should use all its influence to put a stop to the system."

9915. You speak about the sweating system. The Committee have had various definitions, or attempts at definitions, of what is meant by sweating; can you tell us what you mean by it?

I have read the evidence of Mr. Miers, and he gives about the clearest definition of it that I can find.

9916. Can you tell me where that is?

I have not it before me.

9917. What is his definition, in substance?

That it is work given out at a certain price to a man to be done, who gets it done at a less price by subordinate labour.

9918. Lord *Clinton.*] And the man who lets it out not being a skilled workman himself?

I do not think Mr. Miers says that, nor do I think it is so.

9919. *Chairman.*] This is what Mr. Miers says at page 412. He is asked at Question 4213: "What do you understand by the sweating system?" and his answer is, "The employment of subordinate workpeople by a middleman, who gets work in wholesale quantities, or in any quantities, from warehouses, and gets this work done by this subordinate labour at low prices under conditions of exceedingly long hours, and in unsanitary workshops." Is that what you mean?

That is a general statement. The last paragraph is rather too general for my liking; but the definition of the system itself I agree with.

9920. Lord *Clinton.*] Mr. Arnold White defines the sweater as a man who contributes neither capital, skill, nor speculation; what do you say to that definition?

I do not believe that that obtains to so large an extent as Mr. Arnold White states it.

9921. You do not agree with that?

No, I do not. The resolution which I have just read was subsequently circulated amongst the members of the association, who were informed that any injustice arising from sweating coming under their notice, and which was reported by them to the association, would be investigated and receive the committee's careful consideration.

9922. *Chairman.*] Can you give us the names of the members of the committee?

Yes, I could do so. The committee would not be precisely constituted at present as it was then, but pretty nearly so. The vice-presidents, who are *ex-officio* members of the committee, are John Carter, of Messrs. John Carter and Sons, of London; J. Flatau, of the firm of Messrs. A. and W. Flatau and Co., of London; H. Simpson Gee, of the firm of Messrs. Stead, Simpson, and Nephews, of Leicester; George Hickson, of the firm of Messrs. William Hickson and Sons, of London; M. P. Manfield, of the firm of Messrs. Manfield and Sons, of Northampton; and George White, of the firm of Messrs. Howlett and White, of Norwich. Mr. Thomas Lilley, of the firm of Messrs. Lilley and Skinner, of Harrow-road, London, is the chairman of the committee. Then the names of the committee are (all of London): W. Beasley; G. H. Beaver; James Branch; John Branch (who is the honorary secretary); J. J. Britten, of the firm of Messrs. Britten and Bannister; H. P. Brown; John Carter, junior, of the firm of Messrs. John Carter and Sons; T. Clark, of the firm of Messrs. T. Clark and Co.; T. S. David; W. Doggett; W. C. Green; F. Greenwood; William Hickson, of the firm of Messrs. William Hickson and Sons; E Lee; A. Lion (who is the treasurer), of the firm of Messrs. A. J. Lion and Co.; M. L. Lion, of the firm of Messrs. Lion, Lion and Son; W. J. Lorkin; J. Markie; F. S. Miers, of the firm of Messrs. Miers and Levi; W. Pearce; Edward Penton, junior; W. B. Skinner, of the firm of Messrs. Lilley and Skinner; and E. Stubbs, of the firm of Messrs. Stubbs and Grimsdell. In this connection I should state further, that the following resolution has been recently passed by the board of employers in connection with the association, and which deals with all wages questions, namely: "This board, having received, through a deputation

tion which waited upon them, a request from the International Journeymen Boot Finishers' Society that in order to do away with the master sweater, and so secure for their members, the sweatees, a due proportion of the wages paid by the manufacturer, they, the sweatees, should be employed by the manufacturers in their factories, these men being willing that some deduction be made in consideration of grindery, &c., provided, hereby resolves that as the carrying out of this suggestion may be the means of remedying the existing evil, circulars be issued to the manufacturers recommending its adoption where practicable."

9923. Lord *Clinton.*] What is the date of that?

That would be the 13th of last month, June. The secretary being instructed to place members in communication with the secretary of the fore-named society (who, I might mention here, is Mr. Solomon Rosenberg, who has been examined before your Lordships), your Lordships will probably see that the association is opposed to the existence of the sweating system, and is prepared to do all in its power to do away with it, and to ameliorate the condition of those who have suffered thereby. In the remedies suggested by Mr. Arnold White, Mr. Hoffmann, and Mr. F. S. Miers, the association for the most part would be prepared to concur, chiefly such as, Firstly, registration of all places as workshops where subordinate labour is employed; secondly, the affixing of a statement of wages at the wicket; thirdly, extended powers to sanitary inspectors specially qualified, each individual inspector having a knowledge of the special trade in which he would be employed. Mr. Arnold White in his Evidence has compared the former system of manufacture, the hand-sewn, with the present system, the machine-sewn; and whilst referring to the absence of apprentices in connection with the latter, he omits to speak of the great division of labour now obtaining, and the consequently limited range of skill which men are required to possess, and the short space of time in which such skill, with one exception, can be acquired in the various departments of labour; the exception being that of the pattern-cutting and clicking, or cutting of uppers, which can only be properly learnt under an apprenticeship of two or three years. In passing, I observe that apprentices in the other departments are objected to by the workmen; but employers believe better workmanship would be secured by the revival of apprentices, or by trade schools. In consequence of the greater division of labour which the machine-sewn system produced, and of the introduction of machinery out of which the machine-sewn system sprung (and I should here like to say that the improvement of machinery should hardly be spoken of as an evil, producing the sweating system as it was spoken of by Mr. Arnold White), the boot trade labour market was rendered open to a larger influx of workmen from other trades and avocations, from the fact that the increased facilities for manufacture demanded more labour. As a result of the introduction and continual improvement of machinery, and the condition of the labour market, a class of goods are now made for home and foreign consumption, which, though in every way serviceable to the consumer, could not have possibly been produced under the hand-sewn system of bootmaking. It is to be regretted that the altered conditions of manufacture lend themselves to a more easy abuse, whether by unprincipled manufacturers or workmen, who subdivide their work; but it is not from this to be implied that the present system is bad in itself. Though not, perhaps, an unmixed good, yet, because larger employment of labour ensues, and an undoubted and real demand is met without the employed of necessity suffering from being badly paid; the system is good. As to the evils which have produced the sweating system, as already stated, I doubt that the introduction and improvement of the machinery should be included in this category; but admitting that the influx of pauper foreigners, whether immense or limited, is a contributing evil to the sweating system, there is here a larger principle involved than what a manufacturers' association can deal with. Given, that a knowledge of some parts of the work, the finishing especially, under the present system of manufacture, is easily picked up, and that the system itself is capable of easy abuse, it is not to be wondered at that these poor creatures, if allowed to settle here at all, are found to be engaged in a trade under all conditions, seeing that they disembark almost in the midst of the

locality where the boot and shoe industry is largely carried on. I am not prepared to admit that the system of weekly wages is for the most part impracticable, as alleged by Mr. Arnold White. In connection with the trade that I represent, and from a manufacturers' point of view, at least, it has rather to be considered whether the workmen can be trusted to do a fair day's work at a fair day's pay. It is a fact that, except in a few exemplary cases, the lasters and finishers, who are paid by piece-work, seldom do a full week's work even in slack times, when by occasional spurts sufficient work can be obtained. Clickers, as your Lordships, perhaps, have had it explained to you, are paid weekly; and it would, no doubt, save manufacturers a great deal of trouble if the system of weekly wage were in force. The statement by Mr. Arnold White was as follows: "The ranks of the manufacturers were rapidly crowded by persons having no knowledge of the trade. With a little capital they purchased machinery, &c., engaged a competent foreman and a few hands for the various departments. The competition became intense; everyone endeavoured to increase his output of boots, and to increase the number of his customers. These boot manufacturers, not being boot makers, had no pride in their work, and the consequence is that the Colonial markets are flooded with work of the most atrocious and abominable description." It is, I venture to say, exaggerated throughout.

9924. *Chairman.*] Do you know where, in Mr. Arnold White's evidence, that occurred?

In the answer to Question 415, towards the end. It is not correct to say that persons having no knowledge of the boot trade have rapidly crowded the ranks of manufacturers; but, so far as a few persons who can so be described have become manufacturers, they seldom, if ever, would be found among those firms who do a shipping trade; for such trade is almost exclusively confined to houses who have been engaged in it for many years, whose goods are reliable, or they would not be able to do the business which they are doing, and whose standing and reputation as manufacturers is of the first order. With reference to the advisability of manufacturers providing workshops for all workmen which Mr. Hoffman speaks in favour of, I would remind your Lordships of the circular which has been issued from the Manufacturers' Association, and add that some few manufacturers who have been asked to do so are making the experiment at the suggestion of the International Journeymen's Boot Finishers' Society, of which Mr. Solomon Rosenberg is secretary. Mr. Hoffman suggests that every employer should be compelled to put a list of wages he pays outside the wicket. This would, I believe, be met by the association with every encouragement. It has been given in evidence that the condition of the wages question for London is anything but satisfactory, and this is so, viewed from any standpoint. There are rather more than 400 manufacturers of all classes in London, of whom, certainly, not more than 5 per cent. pay to a uniform statement of wages, and this small proportion is divided into two classes, known as the first and second class statement manufacturers, who number 9 and 13 respectively; 9 first-class and 13 second-class. That is the maximum; it would be subject to reduction by various circumstances. The first-class statement came into force many years ago, and is so full of restrictions and inconsistencies that the manufacturers, who are obliged, on account of their small number, to pay to it, would not be able to continue in business if they manufactured the whole of the boots they sell. Two of these manufacturers have already secured branch manufactories in provincial towns where the restrictions do not follow; two other manufacturers are contemplating a similar course; whilst the remainder buy largely of other manufacturers who are not restricted. Similar remarks would also apply to the second class statement manufacturers, only that they have branch factories, and buy in to a larger extent. With reference to the working of the statements, sufficient has been said to show that there is anything but satisfaction among the employers who are compelled to pay to them. I have sat in several meetings where representatives of the employers and workmen have discussed the removal of restrictions, or an extension of the limits of the statements, but such discussion has generally ended without agreement being come to. Certain classes of goods manufactured are provided for at different prices

prices for wages in the second-class statement to the first-class statement. A member of the trades union would refuse to make such classes of work for a first-class statement manufacturer at the same price as a second-class statement manufacturer would have to pay, or he would go to work for a manufacturer under no restriction by either of the statements for even a less wage, for the same class of goods. It would not be impossible for a finisher to work at one and the same time for three such firms on the same class of goods, but at three different prices. Special efforts were unsuccessfully made five or six years ago by the second-class statement manufacturers, and subsequently by the first-class statement manufacturers independently, to come to a more reasonable understanding with the trades union. In order to bring to your Lordships' notice as forcibly as I can one of the chief causes, in my opinion, of the growth and extent of the sweating system, I should like to give a short account of the course the trades union subsequently adopted, which was no doubt meant to remove the just complaint of the first and second-class statement manufacturers, that is that the majority of their competitors are able to work under better terms than themselves.

9925. What trades union do you allude to?

The London Metropolitan branch of the National Union of Operative Boot and Shoe Finishers; Mr. Charles Freake is the secretary of it. A minimum statement of wages for lasters and finishers was served upon all non-statement manufacturers early in March 1884, which bore the following inscriptions: "Any employer or workman making work for less price than this statement will be deemed to be working against the interests of the trade;" and that this statement is "not to apply to any shop now paying wages above this statement;" and, further, "This statement will come into force on and after Monday, 17th March 1884." Perhaps it is hardly necessary for me to inform your Lordship that statement was rejected at a meeting of the manufacturers held that day, 17th March 1884. A strike took place affecting over 300 manufacturers; but, at the intervention of the London Trades' Council, the following understanding was arrived at: "That the men should be advised to resume work in the event of the employers guaranteeing to elect a committee, whose duties shall be to discuss with representatives of the workmen the grievances of the men with a view to drawing out a statement to meet the present requirements of the trade." This was on the 1st of April. Work was resumed on the 21st of April, the following further agreement being made on the 19th: "That an equal number of employers should meet an equal number of workmen with a view of, first, considering the possibility of adopting a ground work price for different classes of work; secondly, if decided affirmatively, to settle such various work; thirdly, the formation of a court of arbitration and conciliation consisting of an equal number of employers and workmen to settle all other questions that may arise now or hereafter." The joint committee referred to in the foregoing was duly formed, there being 12 each side, and commenced its labours early in May. As a result of their joint deliberations, the representatives of the manufacturers and workmen ultimately agreed to a list of wages called the London third-class statement for lasters and finishers, which statement was to have come into force on the 7th July, but the members of the trades union held a mass meeting and repudiated the result of the labours of their delegates, and refused to be bound by their decision. Communication was made to the secretary of the trades union in October last to the following effect: "That the board of employers in connection with the association think it desirable that a board of conciliation should be formed for the whole trade, to which all questions or disputes should be referred. That they invite the trades union to appoint delegates to discuss with them, at an early date, the method by which such board should be formed and governed." Delegates for the workmen were appointed, and a joint meeting took place, but the workmen's representatives were not prepared to agree to the principle of arbitration being embodied in the code of rules which were drawn up, and the reference of this question to the decision of a meeting of their constituents resulted in a large majority refusing to agree with it. The trades

union desired the formation of a board exclusive of an appeal to arbitration. To this the manufacturers would not consent, having in recollection the proceedings in 1884. A letter was received from the secretary of the trades union, dated 22nd March last, in which he intimated that as the result of the series of meetings held by delegates of the workmen, a resolution had been passed to the effect "That it is desirable in the interests of both the employers and workmen that a minimum statement of wages be established for London. That the employers' association be written to, requesting them to appoint a number of manufacturers to meet an equal number of workmen to draw up such a statement." On behalf of the board of employers, I replied to them as follows: "I am directed by the employers' board, which met last evening (27th March), to reply to your letter of the 21st instant, that, as representing the manufacturers of London members of this association, they would be quite willing to meet delegates representing the workmen for the purpose of discussing any wages question affecting employers or workmen, were they able to do so with a prospect of such discussion being attended with something like a useful result, but they fail to see how it can be so, in view of the continued refusal of your constituents to agree to the principle of arbitration, which, if it is not one of the leading objects of trades unionism, has been recognised by the Leicester council of your union in connection with the recent settlement of the dispute in the boot trade at Northampton. I am further directed to call your attention to the resolution passed at the employers' board, at which you and your colleagues were present on the 2nd February last." (The resolution was, That this meeting of the board of employers do further adjourn, in order that another opportunity may be given to the men's delegates to place before their constituents the manufacturers' desire to have the principle of arbitration acknowledged in conjunction with the board of conciliation (and to the resolution passed by this association at their annual meeting on the 29th ultimo, a copy of which resolution was forwarded to you on the 1st instant); the resolution referred to being. That this meeting approves of the action of the employers' section of the board of conciliation in refusing to organise the joint board of employers and workmen without the recognition of the principle of arbitration as a vital part of the constitution of the board, and requests the general committee when re-appointing such board to confirm the action taken by the retiring board in this matter). "It is hoped that your constituents will seriously review the decision by which the principle of arbitration was rejected by them, and see their way to removing the only difficulty which stands in the way of the object which they, as well as the board of employers, would be glad to see attained, viz., a satisfactory settlement of the wages question in London. (*P.S.*). I may say that if agreeable to your constituents, the board of employers are prepared to send a deputation to any meeting where this letter may be considered, to explain the manufacturers' views upon the principle and methods of arbitration." A meeting of the trades union was held on the 12th of May to consider this letter, and adjourned to the 2nd June, for the attendance of the employers' deputation. The deputation attended on the 2nd of June, but in the result the workmen decided not to accept the principle of arbitration as a basis of settling disputes. I should not have troubled your Lordships with this lengthy review, but for the reason that I consider the inconsistency of London trades unionists as being far the greatest evil that has rendered the introduction of the sweating system a possibility.

9926. Perhaps you could explain to the Committee about these statements; when was the first class statement made?

Some years ago; I could not be quite sure when; but about 14 or 15 years ago.

9927. It was made by the masters and the men, I suppose?

Well, it was; but the manufacturers were so small in number that they were obliged to give way.

9928. What

9928. What are the "restrictions" that you speak of?
A ground-work price is fixed and understood in this statement for a particular class of work; but in the case of any newly introduced embellishment of the boot, with which the laster or finisher may have nothing to do, because it enhances the selling value of the boot, or is supposed to do so, the trades' union require 1 *d.* or 2 *d.* to fit the same in their minds, additional to the ground-work price, for that embellishment.

9929. What do you mean by the ground-work price?
Say that a shilling in the ground-work price under the first-class statement; I will assume that it is a shilling.

9930. What are we to understand by the ground-work price?
That is the price at which the work would be given out if it was made in a special manner. Mr. Branch, who is here, will be able to more clearly give you evidence on that point than I should.

9931. I suppose this first-class statement affects only a few manufacturers?
Only nine at the most in London; but they make the very best class of stuff.

9932. They would be West End bootmakers?
No; it would be mostly machine-made work, not hand-sewn work.

9933. Is there another arrangement or statement as regards hand-sewn work?
Yes; of which I have no knowledge; it applies more to shops than to manufactories; it does apply to manufactories, but not to a large extent.

9934. And you say, that owing to those restrictions, the tendency for the work is to leave London and to be made in the provinces?
It is so.

9935. Then with regard to the second-class statement manufacturers?
They are similarly placed. It is a lower grade of goods, but still a good class of stuff.

9936. And when was that settled?
For that I should rather refer you to Mr. Branch. I think about eight or nine years ago, but it was before my time.

9937. Are there no statements of prices in the country at all?
There is a statement of wages recently fixed in Northampton by the workmen and the masters, to which I referred just incidentally.

9938. Not subject to these restrictions?
Not subject to anything like the restrictions that the first and second-class statements are.

9939. And you do not think those restrictions follow that class of work into the provinces?
No, I think not.

9940. I understand, then, from you that the same individual might be working for three different firms under the first and second and third-class statements?
Yes, it is possible.

9941. Making the same class of goods for different prices?
It is possible in some instances.

9942. Therefore I gather from you that the arrangement is of an arbitrary character?
It is decidedly so.

9943. How long have you been connected with the boot trade?
Since November 1882.

9944. You have only been connected with the trade since then?
Yes, that is all. I am not in any way practical.

9945. Are you not a manufacturer yourself?
No, I am salaried secretary of this society.

9946. Then you would not be able to give the Committee information on technical points?
No, not on technical points.

9947. Do you know whether the number of manufacturers in your trade has increased during the last ten years largely?

I could not answer that offhand, but I should think not very largely; they drop out and others take their places.

9948. About the same number?
Perhaps a few more; not an increase to a large extent.

9949. You put the total number at 400?
Just about that; 411.

9950. How do you get at these figures?
From our register.

9951. What is your register?
It would be compiled in connection with our trade protection department.

9952. How do you compile it?
Members of the leather trade make inquiries, through us, about the status of the different manufacturers, and their names would be registered on our books.

9952*. And you consider that all these manufacturers, great and small, are included in about 400?
Yes, I think so.

9953. I suppose you cannot speak as to the character of the work that is produced; you have not a practical and technical acquaintance with it?
No. A good class of work is produced; better than it was I think; but there is a large quantity of commoner stuff, as I have said; but, as to its character, not being a manufacturer, I am not able to speak.

9954. I think you suggested, or rather approved of, the idea of the enforced registration of places where subordinate labour is carried on?
True.

9955. What do you mean by "subordinate labour"?
Any labour except the man's own, whether it is a wife, child, or boy, or a stranger to him.

9956. You mean that every place where work is carried on by more than one person, even if it is by members of his own family, should be registered?
Yes, I personally would go to that extent.

9957. And you suggest, also, that the inspection of these places should be extended?
Yes; I fall in with Mr. Hoffman's suggestion, that sanitary inspectors should have extended powers, and that they should have a technical knowledge of the trade; that they should be chosen by the trade, if it were possible.

9958. What Mr. Hoffman said on that subject was in answer to Question 1075 on page 97. "He is asked: Do you mean an inspector under the Factory Acts?" and his answer is: "Yes; and I would suggest that instead of inspectors, as now, going to all kinds of trades, going to a tailor's shop first and to a boot shop next, different inspectors, having a technical knowledge of the trade, should be appointed inspectors of the shops of those particular trades"; and he goes on to say: "I think it would be as well if workmen could feel that inspectors were not so much their enemies as their friends, to whom they could speak

speak and give expression to their complaints and their desires; and I believe that thereby the Government would get very much better and truer information in reference to the trades from these inspectors than it is possible for them to obtain at the present time"; you agree with that idea?
Yes.

9959. You think that the inspectors should have technical knowledge?
Yes.

9960. Do you mean the sanitary inspector or the inspector under the Factory Act?
I think it would be possible to amalgamate the duties of the sanitary inspector and the inspector under the Factory Act.

9961. You mean, giving each of them the powers of the other?
Yes.

9962. Do you think sanitary inspectors are unwilling to report as to the unsanitary condition of houses, on account of the expense that might be entailed on the ratepayers?
I think that would be a dereliction of duty on the inspector's part; he would have to consider rather the health of the people found in these unsanitary quarters.

9963. We have had it in evidence that, being removable by the local authorities, they are unwilling sometimes to make such reports; have you any view on that?
I have not heard of it.

9964. I gather from you that the society which you represent, which includes a large number of the manufacturers in London and in the country, are anxious to do what they can to abate the evils of the sweating system in the trade?
Precisely so.

9965. And that they would approve, as you said, of the work being carried on in the factories?
Where they have the accommodation. Of course there are a number of small manufacturers who could not afford to erect the factories or provide factory accommodation.

9966. But, where possible, you think it would be a good thing?
Yes.

9967. And as it is not universally possible, you think that the places where it is carried on should be registered, and subject to inspection?
That is the alternative.

9968. And you consider that the action of the trades union has militated against your efforts to abate the evils of the sweating system, on account of the difficulty that arises from their action in arriving at an understanding about wages?
I think if the wages were fixed by a joint board of employers, with arbitration in the back ground, it would be impossible for workman or manufacturer to engage in the sweating system at all; the combination of the two societies would be too strong for him.

9969. I suppose you cannot give the Committee any information as to the nationalities of the workpeople employed in the trade; whether foreigners are supplanting the native-born workpeople or not?
That would not certainly obtain in the best class of work, nor do I think it largely obtains in the commoner class of work.

9970. Earl of *Onslow*.] How would you propose that the statement of wages hung up at the wicket should be enforced by law?
No. Such statement would be, I assume, agreed to by the employers and the trades union through their respective bodies, corporations, or associations,

and any manufacturer found going outside of that statement would be brought to book by the joint board.

9971. Then all you mean is that you think it would be a desirable thing that there should be an arrangement made between the master and the men, that such a statement should be hung up outside the wicket?
Clearly.

9972. You do not wish for any legislative powers to compel that?
No; I have not gone to that extent in my evidence.

9973. Then with regard to the registration, I understand that you propose that every place in which work is carried on should be registered; and would you also propose that the register should be exhibited in any particular place?
Certainly; open to the public or to the particular trade or bodies representing the trade.

9974. I want to know what would be the object of publicity?
Given that we had an arrangement between the employers and workmen, it would be to their joint interest to prevent anything like unsanitary conditions or working under price from being carried on.

9975. Yes; but if you have law, your law must govern every case, whether there is an arrangement between the masters and men or not. Supposing that there was not an arrangement between the masters and the men, what would then be the object of a public register?
I do not see how it would operate in that case.

9976. You do not see any use for it under those circumstances?
No, I do not, if there is nothing to put it in force except a paid official such as a sanitary inspector; an ordinary sanitary inspector would not produce anything like a beneficial effect in such a case.

9977. Then your only object in registration would be to be able to facilitate the knowledge on the part of the trades union of who were working in the trade?
A knowledge on the part of the employers and the trades union.

9978. Not at all in order to facilitate the work of the inspector?
It would do that.

9979. But it would not be worth while, you think, to go to the expense of registration for that object?
Not outside of any arrangement between the employer and the workmen.

9980. I understood you to say that you thought that the powers of the sanitary inspector might be entrusted to the factory inspector?
Yes, certain powers.

9981. You are aware, are you not, that the factory inspector is appointed by the Government?
Yes.

9982. And that the sanitary inspector is appointed by the local authority?
That is so.

9983. You are also aware, perhaps, that the sanitary authority has had power conferred upon it by Parliament to carry out the recommendations of the sanitary inspector, should the owner of the premises decline to do so?
Yes.

9984. Then being aware that the sanitary inspector is appointed by the local authority, and that the local authority has power, where the owner declines to carry out the recommendation of the sanitary inspector, to compel him to do so, or to do it at their own cost and charge him with the expenses, I want to know what power there would be in the factory inspector to do the same thing?
I do not know that I can answer that.

9985. It

9985. It would be a difficulty, would it not?
It is rather a technical question, which I, from my position, would not have much knowledge of.

9986. It would be a difficulty, would it not, to carry out the necessary sanitary reforms by a person who was only the agent of a central office in Downing-street?
To meet that I should suggest, as I have already said, that these Inspectors should have larger powers; Inspectors of Factories should be also Sanitary Inspectors.

9987. When you say "larger powers," do you mean to say that they should have power to go in and do the work?
To go in and see what is wanted, and report that the work is to be done.

9988. But who are they to report to?
To the most efficient authority who is able to carry out their report.

9989. Would not that be the local authority?
It might be.

9990. Then it comes this: that your recommendation would be that there should be an increased number of inspectors, and more efficient inspection by the sanitary authority?
Clearly so, if necessary.

9991. Not by a central authority?
It would not matter much to me which authority appointed these men, so long as they were appointed.

9992. And had the necessary powers?
And had the necessary powers.

9993. What are your objects in desiring that the factory inspector should be specially qualified for the post by technical knowledge of the particular trade?
He would know from his technical experience what conditions would be the best conditions to carry on that class of work, and he would see at once whether the conditions were favourable to the carrying on of that class of work.

9994. Do you mean that a man who had been in the boot trade all his life would know more about the sanitary requirements in that trade than a man in any other business?
Not necessarily; but a man that had been in the boot trade would know whether the work was being carried out as it should be.

9995. Do you mean with regard to the conditions under which it was being carried on?
Yes.

9996. Do you think he would know better than a doctor or a person specially qualified in matters of health?
No, I do not know that he would, I was not contemplating that.

9997. But is not that the object of the inspection?
Certainly.

9998. You have not thought of that?
I have not.

9999. Then further you said that you thought they should be chosen by the trade?
I suggested that.

10000. What do you understand by the trade?
An association like our own, in conjunction with the trades union.

10001. But supposing that association did not represent the whole of the trade,

trade, might there not be an objection to an arrangement on the part of those not represented by it?

There might; but our association does represent the whole of the trade for purposes of that kind.

10002. And any recommendation made by your association would be received by the trade, you think, without any dissentient voice?

Without any great dissentient voice.

10003. Hardly any?

Hardly any.

10004. Have you any knowledge of the practice stated to exist, of not paying the men their full wages, but keeping back a part from week to week in order to retain their services, and prevent them from working for any other person?

Only what I have read in the papers.

10005. You have not had to deal with any such cases on behalf of your society?

No.

10006. Lord *Clinton.*] I think you said that you thought the workmen in your business should be paid weekly wages?

I said it would be less trouble.

10007. That would be irrespective of the amount of work done?

Yes.

10008. Then how do you propose it should be done; so much per hour?

Yes, so much per hour. The clicker is paid so much per week; the manufacturer takes a note of what he does, and if he does not do sufficient for his money he is told of it.

10009. Do you think that system would be satisfactory to the masters and men?

I think it would be satisfactory to the masters, but I am afraid t e men would not agree to it.

10010. Why?

They would be afraid that the masters were taking advantage of them.

10011. How could that be, if they were paid a certain amount per hour?

They would suppose that the masters would want them to do a larger amount of work than it was for their advantage to do.

10012. But I understood you to say that that wage would be irrespective of the amount of work done?

Yes. I have a case in point, the wages ranged in a place from 30 *s.* to 35 *s.* for clickers. A man went in there and did his very best to get as much work done as possible, and it was estimated by his employer to be worth 2 *l.* 5 *s* to him. His fellow-workmen got to know of it, and told him that he was doing much work for his 35 *s.*

10012.* That was a trades union interference?

It was not a trades union in that particular instance; but such would obtain I think with the trades unionists.

10013. You think the workmen would not agree to weekly wages?

No.

10014. I think you said that you were opposed to that minute subdivision of labour of which we have heard?

No; I think subdivision of labour is good. Sub-contracting of labour is where the evil comes in.

10015. But

10015. But you think subdivision of labour not a bad thing for the workmen?
Not necessarily.

10016. But under that system the workman learns only a very small portion of the trade?
That would be so.

10017. Do you not think that a bad thing for the workman?
Not if he earned an amount sufficient to keep him.

10018. You think that is enough?
Yes.

10019. Of course a man who follows a trade in which he learns only a small subdivision of the work could not so easily set up for himself?
No, not unless he went through all the branches of the trade.

10020. That is a disadvantage to him?
To him personally. I would suggest the apprenticeship system; let him go right through the workshop.

10021. And in that system you would propose that a lad should learn the whole of the trade?
Yes.

10022. Is that never adopted in your trade now?
Not as far as the lasting or finishing is concerned, to my knowledge.

10023. Lord *Monkswell.*] You say that we have little practical knowledge of the trade; do you represent the views of your association in the representations you make?
Generally.

10024. You have talked these matters over with the members of your association?
Certainly.

10025. And do you think that your views are in accord with theirs for the most part?
Yes.

10026. And your recommendations?
Yes.

10027. You say the trades union men work for different wages, according as they work for first or second-class statement manufacturers, or for outside manufacturers?
Yes.

10028. Do I understand you that the trades union allow them to do so, or do they do it secretly?
They allow it. If there was a strike on a first-class statement manufacturer's shop, arising from any dispute, a man who had so struck would be sent into a second-class statement manufacturer's shop, and would be allowed to take work there; and under the second-class statement there are several classes of work made for lower prices than are paid under the first-class.

10029. But how about the outside manufacturer?
The same thing applies again; there is a less price there.

10030. Is the trades union very numerous?
The number of their members, I think, is about 1,600.

10031. What proportion do they bear to the non-unionists?
There are about 4,000 or 5,000 altogether in London.

10032. You only speak of London?
Yes, I am only speaking of London.

10033. About 1,600 out of 4,000 you think are unionists?
Yes, 1,500 to 1,600.

10034. Did the employers suggest any particular form of arbitration?
Yes; it was suggested in this way: that instead of one individual being arbitrator there should be three outside men appointed; that one should be appointed by each side, and that the two persons so appointed should choose a third, and that those three should be the court of arbitration.

10035. And what was the workmen's objection; did they take objection to arbitration altogether, or only to the particular form of it, which the masters recommended?
No, they object to it altogether; they say they would never get their way. I believe that is what they say.

10036. *Chairman.*] I asked you just now a question about the idea that the sanitary inspectors did not in all cases do their duty; I want to read you what Mr. Arnold White said about that. In answer to Question 530 he said, "I should like to see the sanitary officer removed from the risk of dismissal by the parochial authorities if he is too active in his work; the sanitary inspector is not infrequently a man very superior to the parochial authorities, and I should like to see him secure in his position, so that he could fearlessly report abuses and evils without the possibility of reprimand or removal in consequence of his doing his duty. Your Lordships will remember the case of Dr. Murphy, who did his duty in St. Pancras. And I would rather see the sanitary authority and the Factory Act inspector both under the Home Office; that is, both under the Imperial Government, not under the Local Government." Do you agree generally with that?
I have not thought over it; but it appears to me reasonable.

10037. You would like also to see the sanitary inspector under the Home Office; not subject to removal by the local authority?
If, as Mr. Arnold White puts it, a man who has done his duty has been dismissed, it seems necessary to put him under some authority that would not remove him under those circumstances. As I say, I have not thought it over, but it seems to me reasonable.

10038. I understand from you that you consider that this subdivision of the work into the various minute branches is not detrimental to the trade, that it is rather beneficial to the trade, but that it may be detrimental to the interests of the individual workman?
Yes.

10039. And you think that might be counteracted by a system of apprenticeship or by schools imparting technical instruction?
Yes. I might mention that my association, in conjunction with the City and Guilds of London Institute, are endeavouring to formulate a scheme for the establishment of a trade school.

10040. Would not such a system of apprenticeship, which would involve passing these men through the various branches of the trade, increase the cost of production?
That, of course, I have not entered into.

10041. If as soon as a man became proficient in one branch you had to take him away and put him to another branch, that would naturally lead to an increased cost of production, would it not?
While he is an apprentice, you mean?

10042. Yes?
I do not think it. The man would find through his apprenticeship what class of work suited him best.

10043. As to the quality of the goods you cannot speak, as I understand you;

you; but I think you said that the manufacturers are not largely recruited by men having no technical knowledge of the trade?

No.

10044. And that the colonial trade was practically in the hands of a few, and that the trade could not be kept up if the quality of the goods was not good?

If it did not suit the market.

10045. I want to call your attention to what Mr. Hoffmann said on that point in answer to Question 1071, on page 96: "As regards our colonial trade, the falling off in that direction is probably due to two causes. One is, as Mr. Arnold White has already mentioned, that the colonial markets have been flooded with shoddy goods. That is true of the boot trade as of many other trades, and therefore the colonists have suddenly turned themselves round, and are using their own raw materials, and are producing goods for themselves. So far as my information goes, the boots they produce in the colonies are not so stylish and well made, but at all events they are all leather, instead of being three parts paper, as a great deal of the English work sent to them is." Do you agree that the colonial trade is falling off at all?

Not to any appreciable extent. I cannot see it from the Returns.

10046. You do not agree either that "the colonial markets have been flooded with shoddy goods"?

I do not think so.

10047. Or that the goods we send out to them are composed three parts of paper?

No, I do not believe that. There may be some such sent out, but it does not apply generally.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. JACOB FLATAU, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

10048. *Chairman.*] You are a boot manufacturer?

I am a boot manufacturer. I am a member of the firm of A. and W. Flatau and Co., boot manufacturers, of London and Northampton; and I am a vice-president of the Boot and Shoe Manufacturers' Association. I have given serious attention to the subject before yonr Lordships. I would define sweating as the distribution of work by a middleman at a reduction on the wages paid by the manufacturer. The term should, however, in my opinion, not be applied as it has been to all subdivision of labour in bootmaking, and to all outdoor labour when practised by men, though I have not found the term applied to women who do the machine closing, which is equally subdivided. I may mention that this system of subdivision obtains all over the country, and is not peculiar to foreign workmen. The objections, however, are not so prominent in the provinces, on account of the sanitary conditions generally being far better. I agree with those witnesses who state that the most radical remedy would be to carry on the entire process of manufacture in the employer's factory, but would point out that this would inevitably lead to still further subdivision, as being the most economical mode of production. If two or more men working in teams, on different sections of a boot, can produce more and better work in a given time than when working singly, that system is bound to prevail ultimately in the teeth of all opposition. This team system (it is termed the team system in America, from which it emanates) is practised throughout in America, to which country mainly we owe the introduction of machinery into the boot trade.

10049. Perhaps yon would explain what you mean by "the team system"?

It is the system in which sub-division is carried to its utmost limits, and the system which obtains in America.

10050. What does a team consist of?

A team to-day in London consists of two or three men; in America it would consist of six or more.

10051. Six men employed in making the different parts of one pair of boots or shoes?

Precisely. This does not, however, mean a reduction of wages to the operative; quite the contrary. This system, however, meets with opposition from the trades unionists. They term it "sweating" whether carried on in the factory or outside, though the Boot and Shoe Manufacturers' Association recommend it as the most efficacious remedy for sweating. Some stress has been laid on the so-called evils resulting from the introduction of machinery. I would state emphatically that the effect of this introduction of machinery, naturally tending to the increase of large manufactories, has been conducive to the improvement of the condition of the operative, who is by no means worse, but far better off than he was 10, 20, or 30 years ago, which is as far back as my personal experience extends. When a witness says that wages have fallen since 1880 from 6 *d.* to 4 *d.* per pair, he suppresses the fact that in such cases one-third less labour would be bestowed on the boot; this third being subsequently done by machinery, such as the heeling and attaching machines. I will give an instance. Before we introduced heeling machinery, some ten years ago, we paid 9 *d.* per pair for lasting a particular class of boot. When we built and attached the heels by machine, we, by agreement, paid 7 *d.* When we occasionally require some of these boots, with hand-built heels, on the old system, we still pay 9 *d.* Last month we happened to require a rather unusual quantity of these boots with hand-built heels, and the men demanded 11 *d.* per pair, stating that they would otherwise earn far less than when making them without heels for 7 *d.* I will explain this. They stop short when two-thirds of the operation is finished, and then get their wages; they do two-thirds of the labour, or what is estimated at two-thirds, and they get a fraction more than two-thirds of the wages.

10052. What evidence were you alluding to when you spoke just now of the reduction of wages?

I have been reading an abstract of evidence made by our secretary, Mr. Craig, and that I have dealt with; I have not any precise particulars with me now.

10053. You do not know the name of the witness?

I rather think this comes from the secretary of the trades union.

10054. Who is that?

Mr. Freak. Probably Mr. Craig, if he has the evidence with him, could turn to it; it is verbatim; but I have not taken the numbers of the answers. Such a statement as that wages have been reduced 30 to 40 per cent. since 1885 by Jewish houses is utterly unwarrantable. Before machinery came into vogue the very best men, as now, earned good wages, but not such good wages. Even for hand-sewn boots the wages are now as high as ever they were; but the majority of the men earned far less, had to work harder, under more unhealthy conditions, and under the same serious drawback which unfortunately still prevails, viz., the fluctuation in the work. When hand-sewn work was universal, all was not of the finest description. The walking boots worn by the masses were paid for at the rate of 1 *s.* 1 *d.* to 1 *s.* 3 *d.* per pair wages, and two pairs constituted a full day's work. The foreign workman had practically the monopoly of the slipper trade, the wages for which were bad then, as they are bad now; but this article when not ousted by the cheaper and smarter foreign made shoe, has been in a great measure displaced by the cheap house boot, made by the same class of workman; and to a very large extent from tops imported from Germany. These boots, common as they are, are better, more serviceable and smarter than the old carpet slipper which they have almost entirely superseded, and allow better wages, low as they are said to be, than the carpet slipper makers', whose wages to-day are practically the same as they were 20 years ago, and who is the worst paid man in the trade. The principal articles imported into the country are cheap house boots of this kind and dress-shoes.

It

It is absurd to say that the few fine goods imported for exceptional requirements have any serious effect on the continually increasing figures which our statistics show. This cheap dress shoe trade is also a very large London industry, and is almost exclusively in the hands of Jews, who alone make an article that will in any way compete with the imported one. I have not succeeded in obtaining any reliable statistics as to the number of foreign boot and shoe makers in London, but I consider 2,000 a liberal estimate.

10055. Two thousand manufacturers, do you mean?

No; 2,000 operatives. It is rather difficult to distinguish between foreign and Jewish, as they are rather involved. I think this is a liberal estimate. According to the last census the number of boot and shoemakers in the country at that time, 1881, exceeded 267,000. When, therefore, a witness states that the wages throughout the country are affected to any appreciable extent by the competition of foreigners in London, I cannot agree with him.

10056. Which witness was that?

I am sorry to say I cannot quote it. Mr. Craig can give it to you, because it is from his notes I have taken it. I know it is verbatim. As to Northampton, which that same witness specially names, I am positive he is wrong. Having a factory there, I am thoroughly cognisant with the facts. I find that only two classes of workmen have been represented to your Lordships, the first and second-class statement men, representing about 5 per cent. of the trade, and the foreigners on the lowest class of work representing another fraction. The bulk of the trade in which both Christian and Jewish workmen are employed on medium class goods by both Christian and Jewish manufacturers has been almost ignored. My firm, for instance, employs from 80 to 90 per cent. of English workpeople, and from 10 to 20 per cent. of foreigners; and this I take to be a not unusual proportion. The earnings of lasters and finishers range, for an average man, from 4 *s.* 6 *d.* to 6 *s.* 6 *d.* per day of 10 hours. It may be interesting to your Lordships to know that my firm has recently tried the experiment recommended by the Boot and Shoe Manufacturers' Association, of taking a few of these so-called sweatees into the factory, leaving the apportioning of our wages entirely for the secretary of their own association to arrange, and with this result, that in a day of 10 hours they will earn from 5 *s.* to 7 *s.* When doing the same work out of doors for the knifer they receive 20 per cent. less. Out of this 20 per cent. the knifer would pay his rent, gas, tools, &c., and would call for and deliver the work. Some considerable time will necessarily elapse before the thorough factory system can become general. In the meanwhile I consider that all workrooms should be subject to thorough supervision under the Factory Acts, and to compulsory registration.

10057. How long have you been in business?

Personally 30 years, and my firm from 40 to 50 years.

10058. Do you export?

We do.

10059. Where do you export principally?

We export to every part of the world; India, Australia, the Cape, South America; to Japan also.

10060. Do you find much competition in the export trade with foreign countries; I mean do foreign countries compete with you for that export trade?

They compete with us, but we can stand the competition; we can hold our own very well.

10061. You have not found the export business falling off in the Colonies?

Not in consequence of foreign competition. The Colonies are inclining to increase their tariffs; they are steadily increasing their tariffs with a view of protecting their own manufactures; we have to contend with that, but we have to overcome it through the excellence of our workmanship.

10062. Do you agree with what has been stated before the Committee, that the

the inferiority of our workmanship is telling against us with regard to our export trade to the Colonies?

No; the quality of the goods exported by English manufacturers is of a very fair class.

10063. As good as ever it was?

As good as ever it was, speaking broadly. I do not know that I ought to say so, but our firm has had prize medals all over the world; and I do not pretend to be a manufacturer of the very finest class of goods.

10064. What is the class of goods that you export to Australia?

A thoroughly good class of goods; a trifle above the average.

10065. Men's boots, do you mean?

Men's, women's, and children's; less men's, because they manufacture those more readily there. So soon as a colony commences to manufacture they naturally begin with the lower class of men's goods; having the material at hand requiring a less degree of finish, that is generally the first article they turn to.

10066. How many hands do you employ in your own factories?

They will vary from 500 to 1,000, according to the fluctuations of the trade.

10067. Where are your factories?

In Ropemaker-street and Finsbury-street, London, and Palmerston-road, Northampton.

10068. I am talking of London; how many do you employ in London?

I suppose about 20 per cent. of the number stated will be at Northampton; so we should employ in London about 80 per cent.

10069. Do you manufacture completely in your own factories; do you complete the article from beginning to end?

In exceptional cases only.

10070. What is the general process by which you conduct your business?

Where machinery requires the men at hand to feed the machines, they would work in the factory.

10071. Do you mean that where boots and shoes are made entirely by machinery they are manufactured on your own premises; or do you mean that the machine-made portion of the work is done on your own premises?

I mean that, in the majority of cases, the boot is not manufactured entirely on the premises, but very nearly so.

10072. Up to what stage?

The greater portion of the boot is made by machine, and consequently up to that stage it is made on the premises. That is in the case of large manuactories. There are small manufactories all over the country, where the work is carried backwards and forwards to a ridiculous extent.

10073. Then you put out the work to be finished to various persons?

Mostly.

10074. Do you employ generally the same people to finish your work, or do you put it out to whoever will do it cheapest?

The same people for years together.

10075. Have you any knowledge of the circumstances or conditions under which that portion of the work is done?

When I read the evidence that was given before this Committee, I made it my business to visit some of these out-door workpeople. I took a list of our out-door workpeople and visited them, with a view of seeing the conditions under which the work is done.

10076. That is the people who do your work?

The people who do my work.

10077. What

10077. What did you gather from your visits?
I found the sanitary conditions generally bad.

10078. Do you know at all through how many hands the work goes after it leaves you?
It goes through no hands; we give no work out to middlemen.

10079. Who do you give it to?
To the operatives.

10080. To be made in their own homes?
Yes.

10081. And do not these operatives, to whom you give the work out, employ other men to work for them in their own homes; how do you know that they do not?
I went to see.

10082. Went to see them all?
I went sufficiently far to get a thorough knowledge of the subject.

10083. And did you find in no cases that they were employing other men to work for them?
With them. I found in each case what I expected to find, that the man to whom we gave the work was a workman.

10084. But employing other men under him?
He would in cases employ two to three men.

10085. It has been stated before the Committee that work is purposely held back by the large manufacturers in the slack time in order to affect the prices; is that the case at all?
It is difficult to say. I am scarcely prepared to believe it, but it might be the case. It would be very disreputable. I have noticed the statement. It certainly should not be taken as a type of the trade.

10086. You think it is not generally done?
Oh, dear no.

10087. You get your orders, I suppose, from agents?
From our agents abroad and travellers at home.

10088. And as you get the orders, you complete your portion of the work on your own premises, and put it out to be finished immediately?
Yes.

10089. And, I presume, you have no knowledge of the hours of work or wages of the men who do the finishing work?
I have. I can tell you what a man can earn on our wages, for this reason (I think I stated it in my evidence), that we took some of these men into the factory with this view.

10090. You told us that they earned 20 per cent. more working in your factory than they could earn outside?
Yes, in the same hours; because I read this statement, which rather staggered me, that the wages which certain manufacturers gave was divided into two, and that only half went to the actual workman. That was really what induced me to visit these men personally. It appeared then that these sweatees, as I will call them, have an association, and the secretary asked our firm to take these men indoors. I said that as an experiment we would try a dozen of them. We have done so, and we find that on our average work they will earn 5 *s.* to 6 *s.* 6 *d.* per day of 10 hours?

10091. I understand then that you do not agree to the statement that the work

work is divided into two halves, one-half going to the sweater and the other half to the sweatee?

I wish to correct that to this effect, that the master workman will earn 20 per cent. instead of 50 per cent., as is stated. The result of my investigation shows me that his proportion of earning is 20 per cent. in excess of the actual value of his labour; and out of this 20 per cent. he has to pay for rent, gas (not gas for lighting, but gas for the work), socking, tools, &c. There are really three sections: the boots after they are knifed and finished have to be socked. Then he loses time in fetching and carrying the work, which these men indoors of course are not subject to.

10092. Then I should gather from that, that as far as your investigations go in your opinion the master sweater does not make an undue profit?

If your Lordships remember my definition, I call a master sweater a middleman. With the middleman I have no sympathy whatever. There are such. I have not looked for them. I have made it my business to see that there were none amongst my men.

10093. By a middleman you mean a man who does not work himself at all?

Yes, or not in an appreciable proportion. If I found a man working with 10 other men and doing something scarcely appreciable I should still call him a middleman.

10094. I want to call your attention to the evidence of Mr. Samuel Wildman about the way in which the work is put out. I asked him this at Question 720: "You told us that when trade was bad, you sometimes had no work to do for a number of days?—(*A.*) Yes. (*Q.*) Then you get an order which has to be done at once?—(*A.*) Yes. (*Q.*) So that you have to work perhaps 18 hours a day till it is finished?—(*A.*) Yes. (*Q.*) How do you account for that; I mean, how do you account for the fact that there may be several days, and perhaps a week or two, without your getting any orders, and then, when you do get an order, it must be finished at once?" His answer is: "The irregularity and absence of system is in the manufacturers; it is not in consequence of the order being one that has to be finished at a certain time, but it is in consequence of the manner in which the manufacturers give it. The manufacturer has always got his order a day or two before the time when he gives it out to the finisher; but it is usual that if the knifer goes to the shop of the manufacturer at 12 o'clock, dinner-time, the manufacturer keeps him there till four or five o'clock, past mid-day, and then he gives him out four or five dozen of boots to finish, and he tells him that he must have them in the next morning by 9 or 10 o'clock. That is why we are compelled to work so late, and the work is therefore irregular;" do you think that is a correct statement?

I have no reason to suppose it is not correct in exceptional cases. I really am not competent to form an opinion on exceptional cases like that.

10095. You would consider that an exceptional case; this is not given to the Committee as an exceptional case, but as the general rule?

It might be the general rule in a shop or two for which he had worked.

10096. It is not the case in your firm?

Decidedly not. We have orders extending over 12 months; they may not be sufficient to keep our factories fully going; but in the export trade, or even amongst the larger manufacturers who cater for the home trade, the orders are large; they are not from hand to mouth like that. I may say that the tendency amongst retail buyers is to decrease the volume of their orders and so make it difficult; but still a statement of that kind could not apply to any general trade.

10097. If it is correct, I presume I should be right in saying that it is more likely to apply to small manufacturers than to larger ones?

I have no means of judging. I can simply say that it seems to me an extraordinary state of things.

10098. Do you employ principally English workpeople or foreigners?

I have stated the proportion; from 10 to 20 per cent. of Jews and foreigners.

10099. And

10099. And the men to whom you put out your work to be finished, are they principally English or foreigners?
They would be mixed, both English and foreigners.

10100. Do you know at all whether the trade, or any portion of it, is passing out of the hands of the English and into the hands of foreigners?
It is difficult to say.

10101. You have no opinion about that?
It is difficult to say. I have explained that there are certain sections of the trade where the Jewish workmen, working for manufacturers who make solely lower class goods, are the men who previously made the cheap class of hand-sewn work, and that class of work does not come into competition with the better class of work done by English workmen; apart from the general good and middle-class trade, there is a low class trade which is very much in the hands of foreigners.

10102. And does it tend to become more in the hands of foreigners than it used to be?
No.

10103. It has always been in their hands?
It has always been in their hands.

10104. And you do not think that what has been termed the foreign pauper immigration has had any large effect upon the boot trade?
I would say not. It would be a question of degree. I think I should say that I consider that there is a surplus of labour.

10105. Do you think that the fact of the Jewish immigrants being willing, or compelled, to work for very low wages, has any effect in reducing the general rate of wages?
I am sorry to say that I find so much exaggeration in the statements that have been made, that I do not know what amount of credit to give them. The statement of fact that they are given very low wages is one which I am inclined to doubt.

10106. Do you mean that you doubt that these greeners, as they have been called, work at the low wages that have been stated?
I am afraid I am a little at a loss to know what a greener is.

10107. What we have been given to understand by a greener is this: that the term is generally applied to foreign immigrants, principally Jews, who arrive in this country ignorant of the bootmaking or tailoring trade, chiefly bootmaking, and that owing to circumstances of the case, they work generally for a time for nothing, and afterwards at very low wages, and then the wages are gradually increased till they become more or less proficient in the trade?
I should think that condition of things is quite possible.

10108. I want to know whether that condition of things in your opinion has had any effect in reducing the general rate of wages?
A condition of things like that which you name, which I can quite understand, would obtain, or does obtain, must certainly tend to reduce wages; but I must repeat that wages to-day are as high as ever they were.

10109. You would not agree, I should gather then, with the evidence that has been brought before the Committee to the effect, that if this immigration of foreign labour was checked, it would largely lessen the complaints that have been made against exclusively low wages, and do a great deal towards checking the evils of the sweating system, in the shape of long hours and unsanitary conditions?
No; the proportions are relatively too unimportant.

10110. You mean that the numbers are not large enough to have a large effect?
The numbers are not large enough to have any appreciable effect.

10111. Would it not be the case that a comparatively small number of men, willing to work at very low wages, might affect wages over a large area, and of a great number of people?

You see I am always met by the act that it has not done so. We do not conduct our business on philanthropic principles alone, and we are paying the same wages as we did many years ago.

10112. Do you mean to say that the wages have not decreased in any branch of the trade?

I would not go so far as that; in exceptional branches they may have done so.

10113. In the production of the cheaper kind of goods?

I have heard it distinctly stated, and I must believe it; but certainly they have not to the extent stated; and it is not within my knowledge that they have decreased at all.

10114. You cannot speak on that point?

If I am to speak, I must say that I doubt it.

10115. We have been told that as far as the bootmaking trade is concerned, the sweating system, as it is called, is almost entirely, if not entirely, confined to Jews; and you would not be able, I presume, to speak on that point?

Do you mean the sweating system as applied to men or manufacturers? I know that Christian manufacturers employ the same men as the Jewish manufacturers, and that Christian workmen work in teams, with a sub-division of labour, in the same way as Jews.

10116. What I want to get at from you is, whether you have a personal acquaintance with the cheaper branches of the trade, which we have been informed are principally in the hands of foreigners, of Jews?

Our class of goods go pretty low down; we have a very general range of goods ranging from nearly the top to very nearly the bottom; and I might say that, in going round to these men, I found in some cases that they did not work solely for us, even though they only had two men, but other masters, both Christian and Jewish.

10117. I will read you what Mr. Freak said on that point; he is Secretary of the National Boot and Shoe Riveters' and Finishers' Association. He was asked in Question 3426, "You are speaking now of Christians, are you?" And his answer was: "No, I am speaking of foreigners. As regards the sweating system, very few Christians work at it at all. In the Christian houses the workmen are simply employed in two parts, one man to last the boots, to put tha stuff on; another man finishes the boot right out with his own hands, and he receives his wages for it, and finishes himself, and employs no labour; whereas the Jewish foreigner takes it out, and employs finishers to follow the knifer, and pays them half the wage. He would knife for three men; he would therefore earn the wages of three men. But in the case of employing the knifer as well, it is made much more profitable for him; and the result of this system as regards Christian labour is such that it has reduced the wages to such an extent that a Christian really could not, working ordinary hours, get a fair livelihood." Then in the next question he is asked: "I thought you said just now that wages have gone up among the Christian workmen?" And his answer is: "In the Christian houses the wages are about the same as they were in 1875; but the Jewish houses, by the sweating system, have produced cheap goods, and therefore they have taken away from the Christian houses to a very large extent the middle and commoner class of work that they had previously made, and these are made by the Jews at a reduced price, indeed at such a price that a man working single-handed would have great difficulty in getting a livelihood"; would you agree with that?

No; I maintain that a Christian workman earns more money per day than he ever did.

10118. The Witness here says that the wages are the same as they were in 1875; you say that they are larger?

Yes.

Yes. I thought you were referring to my statement, in which I said they were larger, and the witness there said they were not.

10119. He says they were the same as in 1875?
And I maintain that they are larger.

10120. I wished to ask you principally whether you agree with what he said, that "the Jewish houses, by the sweating system, have produced cheap goods, and therefore they have taken away from the Christian houses, to a very large extent, the middle and commoner class of work that they had previously made;" is that correct?
I do not see the force of the argument.

10121. I am asking you whether it is correct?
Does he mean by the Jewish houses, all the Jewish houses; or does he mean exceptional Jewish houses? Does he mean the Jewish houses at the top or the Jewish houses at the bottom?

10122. I will read it to you again if you do not understand: "But the Jewish houses, by the sweating system, have produced cheap goods, and therefore they have taken away from the Christian houses, to a very large extent, the middle and commoner class of work." Do you think that is correct, or that it is incorrect; or do you know nothing about it?
I do not agree with it.

10123. Lord *Thring*.] You say, and I daresay you are right, that the team system will ultimately prevail, because it produces goods much cheaper; but you did not say whether you thought it was for the benefit of the workmen in general that it should prevail; do you think that a system like that benefits the team, from the top to the bottom?
That would depend on results. If the consequence of the team system would be that a young man who is set to the least experienced part of the work would never aspire to get on to the more difficult part and better-paid part of the work, it would be prejudicial to the workman; but if we take it that an average workman would, by working in these teams, make use of what is practically an apprenticeship, and work on to a higher grade, it would be to his benefit, and would really be a system of apprenticeship, which we have lost entirely in our trade.

10124. I did not understand that, but what I did understand from the witnesses who have been before us was exactly the contrary; they said that the team system in effect keeps the lowest horse in the team only to one particular sort of work, and he never aspires beyond it, and is not fitted to go beyond it?
I do not agree with that at all. I think you will find, and I have read in the evidence before your Lordships, that taking these men who come in as finishers, they are subsequently knifers, and, as has been stated here, ultimately masters.

10125. But does not the team system consist in this: that you subdivide the work; there are the higher and the middle, and the lower work, we will say; the lower work is of course less highly paid than the middle, and the middle less highly paid than the highest; how does the man who has only been trained to the lower work get into the higher grade; that is what I want to know?
I am giving an opinion on what is to happen in the future; I would take it as an apprenticeship; the apprentice is put on to work at the side of a more efficient workman, and thus he learns his trade.

10126. Granted; but I thought that the essence of the team system was, that you would always have a quantity of cheap labour at the bottom?
But assuming for the moment that that cheapest labour is that of a boy, he will not always remain a boy, nor will he always work at a boy's wages.

10127. I do not think your illustration is correct. Take the case of a table (with which I am more familiar than with the bootmaking). We are told that

one man makes the leg, another makes the top, and that there is no skilled workman required in making the table, except the man who puts the whole together, that all the rest is unskilled work. Then I want to know how the lower horses in the team, who only make the legs of the table, are to learn to do the higher work. You may put it in your own trade; I have been obliged to put the illustration of the table because I do not know the corresponding way to put it in the boot trade. The lowest sort of labour in the boot trade, we were told, can be done by perfectly unskilled workmen; they learn it in a fortnight, I think a witness told us; how does your team system make that workman go on to the next stage, whatever it is?

My answer is that the men with the most intelligence would, by working at the side of men who are doing a superior class of work, work up to it; the men of a low order of intelligence would not.

10128. Then your opinion is that the team system does not tend to degrade the workman by keeping him so long to one particular sort of work, because he will certainly, if he is an intelligent man, elevate himself; that is your opinion?

Yes. I think that a man would be of an extraordinarily low order of intelligence if he were to sit at the side of another all his life, doing the same thing, without aspiring to do the more skilled work.

10129. As a matter of fact you do not think that is the case?

We have not this team system in effect. I simply say that the effect of bringing different operations into a factory under one roof will tend to a division of labour and to a further introduction of machinery.

10130. But you introduce now the important factor of bringing them into a factory; but we were told that this lower class of labour is not done in a factory, but that the people work by themselves in places which have been described as dens?

I do not defend that system for a moment as being a desirable state of things; by no means.

10131. I am not trying to puzzle you. I want to know whether what you want is a team system combined with a factory system?

Yes. I do not call this outdoor system a thorough team system; this is a system of manufacture carried out under difficulties, in many cases under very insanitary conditions, in rooms unfit for the purpose and without the proper appliances or conveniences for work.

10132. I understand that you are acquainted with the American system; you say that they make goods cheaper by the team system; do you mean by that that all these goods should be made in a factory, and that there should be, as there necessarily would be, a gradation of labour in that factory?

Precisely. The bulk of the machines which we use in our trade are American machines. If an American would come to us to offer a machine, the chances are he would say, "Now you use this machine with a team of a certain number of men at the side of it in the factory." Many manufacturers would say, "We have not got the room; we must do as much as we can in the factory, and give the rest out." But this factory system being the best system we shall ultimately come to it, and that is what we have to aim at.

10133. Is not the result of your opinion that you deprecate the subdivision of labour which leads to the lowest gradation of labour being done in these sweaters' dens, but that you would approve of a factory system in which there should be a graduated system of labour, and in which, by the fact of the men being in one factory, the lower men, if they were men of intelligence, would rise to the middle and higher classes?

Holding the opinion that subdivision is the more economical mode of arriving at a certain result, I cannot say that it is objectionable to subdivide it; I say it is most desirable to subdivide it in the factories.

10134. I do

10134. I do not say that you can prevent subdivision; but surely if it is carried to the extent that the lower class of labour is conducted entirely in these sweaters' dens by people who do nothing but one everlasting monotonous act, for example, sewing up trousers, or seams, or making buttonholes; that must, must it not, necessarily tend to degrade the labourer?

I do not see the necessity. Let me take this as an instance: we are one of of the few boot manufacturers in London who have a sewing machine room. We are said to have the best arranged room in London. There the work is split up into an enormous number of sections, yet I find that those women are in as good a condition as any of their class; and that should follow right through the boot.

10135. That is a case of their being in a well-ordered factory, which I can quite believe yours to be; but I want to ask you whether you do not think that if these machines were distributed amongst the lowest class of workers working by themselves, always at one particular task, that would tend to degrade them?

I would just say that I consider the system to be inevitable, whatever the consequences may be.

10136. Lord *Sandhurst.*] I presume that you are the managing partner in your firm?

I am the senior partner.

10137. You told us just now that a great deal of work was put out by you, but I understood you to say you employed no middlemen?

Precisely.

10138. Therefore every man in your factory is in direct communication with the firm?

We have a manager who attends to the out-door department.

10139. Every man is in direct communication with you own manager, I will say?

Yes.

10140. That appears to me to be bringing capital and labour together as closely as possible?

I think so.

10141. I have also been told, not in this Committee, but I have heard it privately, that a number of boot merchants allow their people to take their work home for their own natural convenience; for instance, that they can work more hours in that way, and do more work and gradually build up fortunes of their own; but that does not necessarily imply that they are sweating that work?

No, I do not consider that to be the case. The fact of the work being out-door labour, and the fact of the work being subdivided, by no means, in my opinion, constitute sweating.

10142. And it enables a very hard-working man to do more work and make more money than a man who does it in the factory?

It does. I will go as far as to say that I find they do work in some cases unduly long hours out of doors.

10143. That is purely voluntary, is it not?

Yes, but it is an evil which I deprecate.

10144. Lord *Monkswell.*] Do I understand you to say that the Americans introduced machinery into the boot trade?

Yes.

10145. That it was not known in England before it was introduced in America?

The majority of the machinery used in this country is American.

 10146. What

10146. What I want to know is, was any machinery used here before machinery was imported from America, in the boot trade?

I know of none. The two principal machines in the boot trade are the sewing machine that sews the tops, and the sewing machine that sews the bottoms, both being American.

10147. Do I understand you to reckon all Jews as foreigners, in your estimate of foreign workers?

I have in my evidence, I fear, somewhat mixed the terms; but if I used the term "foreigner" it would be advisedly, to intimate that all foreigners would not be Jews; and when I use the word "Jews," I wish to infer that all Jews would not be foreigners; but it was very difficult in my evidence to keep the two separate. We have English Jews working for us and foreign Christians.

10148. In point of fact, then, when you draw a distinction between Englishmen and foreigners, you do not include all Jews under the term of foreigner?

I do not.

10149. You say that you found that the sanitary condition of the places where your workmen worked was generally bad?

In many instances bad.

10150. Did you do anything to put a stop to that state of things?

What I did was this. First, I should like to be allowed to say that in no case did I find these men working, as has been stated, in dwelling-rooms or in bedrooms, in no single case; but I did find crowding. I found a very sad want of paint and whitewash, and I asked these men what could be done to remedy it. I went so far as to offer to build them workshops on the spot if they would work together. I must go back, and say that we did try and did offer them workrooms and dwelling-rooms combined immediately opposite our factory, many years ago, but it proved a failure.

10151. Why was it a failure?

The men do not like the restrictions. They did not receive my offer with any favour (the men, I mean, who immediately took my work out) as to building workshops on the spot. Then I went further, and put myself into communication with the secretary of the sweatees, who said, "The best thing you can do for the men is to take them on to your factory." That experiment is now pending. I have taken a number of them on to the factory; and certainly I did not mean to go down and see the conditions under which these men worked without doing my best to ameliorate them.

10152. Are you enlarging your factory, then, with a view to taking these men in?

We happen to have just added a factory to our own, almost as large as the original one.

10153. Do I understand you to have expressed a decided opinion that for the most unskilled work the wages are as high as ever they were; do you include the most unskilled work in what you say about wages being as high as they ever were?

I do. I explain that by stating that the carpet-slipper-maker of to-day is the lowest paid man in the whole of the trade, his wages being precisely the same as when I came into business.

10154. Do I understand you to say that the carpet-slipper-maker is paid lower wages than the man who does the most unskilled part of the boots?

Yes.

10155. The greener, then, who may be employed at the boots gets higher wages than the carpet-slipper-maker; is that what you mean?

I cannot recognise these greeners in any statement that I make. If these greeners, as has been stated here, and as I am prepared to believe, work for nothing, and the wages go to the man in connection with whom they work, I cannot

cannot recognise them as operatives at all. The wages in that case goes into somebody else's pocket. I am speaking, as a manufacturer, as to the rate of wages paid by manufacturers. The other is a case of middleman sweating, pure and simple. I cannot defend it for a moment. I consider it objectionable in every way.

10156. Have you any personal knowledge of the condition of these people who work under the sweaters?
No.

10157. Then it may be as bad as is made out; the condition of these people who are sweated may be as bad as is made out in the evidence you have heard read out?
I have contradicted nothing of that kind, as regards the condition of these greeners; but so far as the manufacturers, even the lowest class of manufacturers, being responsible for it, I must disagree. That is coming back to the first part of your question; it is not in consequence of the low rate of wages paid by the manufacturer, however low that wage may be; even if it be as low as is stated there, the earnings would be equal to those of a carpet-slipper maker. If it is again subdivided, of course it is indefensible.

10158. But, as far as you know, there may be sweaters who employ very unskilled workmen at starvation wages?
I take it for granted, and am prepared to believe, that these greeners, if they have wages at all, have starvation wages; but I do not take it to be anything like the rule of the trade, or that it can be fairly applied to the London manufacturers, or to the Jewish manufacturers, but to exceptional circumstances, in proportions which are far less than what I gathered from what I read in the press.

10159. Lord *Sandhurst.*] But as regards the workers out of the factories, it is very good of you to go down and see after them, but as regards yourself and your firm, the out-workers, who live in these places, are absolutely free, and you have nothing to do with the houses in which they live?
Certainly not.

10160. All that concerns you is to see that they take the work out and bring it home when completed?
Yes.

10161. And that freedom of living in these houses, away from your factory, enables the very industrious men to do more work than a man who does just what he is obliged to do?
Precisely.

10162. *Chairman.*] I suppose you do not know, of your own knowledge, what wages these out-workers or middlemen pay; that would not come under your knowledge?
I do know.

10163. How do you know?
If your question applies to the out-door workers, I do know; if your question applies to the middleman, I do not know.

10164. How do you know as regards the out-door workers; say you put out some work to a man who employs three or four men under him; how do you know what he pays them?
Because I have made inquiries.

10165. He would tell you what he was paying them?
I have made inquiries, and the facts I ascertained are at your service.

10166. From whom did you make inquiries?
From all the men. I think I can take it that I know; I can give you the figures.

10167. When you say that the wages have increased, do you mean that the wages

wages which all the men working for those who are doing out-work for you earn are larger than they were before?

I mean the rate of wages paid by us.

10168. I am not asking about the wages paid by you; I am asking you whether by that you mean that the wages which these men working for the men to whom you give your work get are larger than they used to be?

I do not go so far as that. I am dealing with the wages paid by the manufacturers.

10169. And you cannot tell what length of hours they work either?

Out of doors, do you mean?

10170. Yes?

I have made inquiry, and I find that they work excessively long hours.

10171. In your opinion, would any legislation, or any interference, that tended to increase the price of production, have a bad effect upon the export trade; a seriously bad effect?

Yes. I hope that means will be found of framing some legislative measures that will not materially increase the price of production.

10172. What I want to know is whether the competition to which you are subjected, either by foreign countries in the colonial trade, or by the colonies themselves, is such as that, if you increased the price of production, even to a small extent, it would endanger the export trade of this country?

It would not assist it; but I should be glad to see any measure that would deal with certain admitted evils. If manufacturers cannot produce their goods without their men working 18 hours a day, then, I think, they must stand the racket, and go without the trade. There is no necessity for boots being manufactured in this country under such conditions as a man having to work 18 hours a day.

10173. You think that the trade could be carried on in a healthier and better way as regards sanitation and length of hours, and so on, without any risk of losing the export trade altogether?

I, as a manufacturer, would be inclined to take that risk.

10174. Do you agree with what Mr. Craig told the Committee about sanitary inspection, and inspection under the Factory Acts?

I cannot pretend to give an opinion as to the division of the responsibility. I agree with him that the workshops should be subject to thorough inspection. I do not agree with him that it is necessary for the inspector to have a technical knowledge. It would be difficult enough, I apprehend, as it is, to get an adequate supply of inspectors to inspect all these workshops; and if we hamper the matter with restrictions about technical knowledge I think we shall have insuperable difficulties.

10175. You think the inspection is insufficient at present?

I find there is no inspection over these subsidiary workshops, which I consider very requisite.

10176. And you think they ought to be registered?

I think they ought.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

19*th July* 1888.

MR. THOMAS LILLEY is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

10177. *Chairman.*] You are a member of the firm of Lilley and Skinner?
Yes.

10178. Where are your factories?
At Paddington-green and in the City; Blossom-street; and at Norwich and other places.

10179. Have you heard what Mr. Craig and Mr. Flatau have told the Committee?
Yes.

10180. Do you agree generally with what they have told us?
Generally, but not altogether.

10181. Perhaps you will tell the Committee in what you differ from them?
With regard to Mr. Craig's evidence upon the question of sanitary inspection, I agree in the first place that all workshops should be registered, and I think that the work of inspecting those shops might be carried on by one man acting as sanitary inspector and also as workshops inspector; but I do not agree that it would be necessary that a man, in order to be an inspector, should have a knowledge of the trade, or that it would be necessary to appoint one for each trade. I think that a knowledge of sanitation would be all that would be required.

10182. We have had it in evidence that, owing to the various tricks and dodges in the trade, it would be impossible for a man who had not some technical acquaintance with the trade to ensure that the Acts are not evaded?
I fail to see that.

10183. You think that is not the case?
No.

10184. In what other respects do you disagree with what Mr. Craig told the Committee?
Generally I agree with him.

10185. Do you manufacture entirely on your own premises?
No; a great deal of the work is done off the premises. I may say in the country factories nearly the whole of the work is done in the people's homes, in the villages, and in the town of Northampton.

10186. You mean the whole of a portion of the work, I suppose?
Nearly the whole of the work in the villages is done in the people's homes.

10187. Do you mean that they produce a pair of boots from beginning to end in their own homes?
As far as cutting up the leather is concerned, that is done in the factory, the rest of the work being done in the homes of the people.

10188. Is not that the case in London?
No.

10189. What is the case in London; how is it done in London?
Many of the men called the lasters work in the factories, though a great deal of the lasting work is also done in the homes of the people.

10190. Do you put out your work to a great number of people in London?
Yes.

10191. Do you know anything about them personally; do you know whether they are operatives themselves, or whether they are merely middlemen who do no work at all?
They are operatives in every case.

10192. That you know?
That I know positively.

10193. Do you know anything about the circumstances under which their work is done, as to sanitation, and wages, and hours, and so on?
Yes. So far as my own men are concerned, I do not think there is any special cause of complaint. I should like their condition to be better.

10194. Do you constantly employ the same men?
Yes.

10195. Is there much competition among them to get the work from your house, for instance?
No, there is no competition, because there is a fixed regular wage; there has been for years in our own factory.

10196. But is there a great competition to get work at that wage?
No.

10197. You do not frequently get applications for work?
In the slack time of the year of course we do; we have more then.

10198. How has that rate of wage been fixed?
By an agreement with the workpeople made some years since.

10199. By "wage," do you mean the price at which these men who take work are to be paid for so many dozens of boots and shoes?
Yes.

10200. As to the wages they pay their workmen, of course you have no cognisance of that?
They are the workmen that we employ.

10201. But they employ men under them?
No, we employ the men directly ourselves.

10202. And the work is done in their own houses?
Yes.

10203. They do not employ men in their own rooms?
No.

10204. How do you know?
Because we only give them out one man's work at a time, and he brings it back.

10205. How do you know they do not get work from other people?
I am not in a position to say; they might occasionally.

10206. Are you an exporter?
Yes.

10207. What do you think about the danger to the export trade that might result from anything tending to increase the cost of production?
I am of opinion that the condition of things might be very much improved without any appreciable difference being made to the cost.

10208. But do you think any additional cost would be bad in its effect upon the export trade?
Not at all. I think that if there was a minimum statement of wages for all London the trade would not be interfered with.

10209. We heard just now about the heels being made by machinery in some cases, and by hand in other cases; could you explain to the Committee what the difference is; in what class of boots they are made by machinery and in what class by hand?
It is the putting on of the heels of which the former witnesses spoke. They are either put on by hand or by machine; when they are put on by machine there is a reduction from the full price which is paid.

10210. Are

10210. Are they as well made when they are put on by machine?
Yes, they answer quite as well for the cheaper kinds of work.

10211. Why is it that they are ever put on by hand?
They are put on by hand only in the better class of work.

10212. You mean that in a certain class of work the machine-made heels have entirely superseded hand-made?
Yes, in the cheaper kind.

10213. Is there any particular point you wish to mention to the Committee?
I should like to say that I have been for some years past, as Chairman of the Boot and Shoe Manufacturers' Association, very much interested in this question of sweating, and have presided at different meetings where we have discussed the question, and tried to see what steps could be taken with a view of suppressing it; and I have also attended a meeting of the sweaters which was held in Whitechapel, at a schoolroom lent by the Reverend S. A. Barnett; and what I have always endeavoured to do is to make it known that the association will be ready to lend its sympathy and aid to the men who are suffering, and to advise co-operation with the manufacturers themselves. My experience of the manufacturers generally leads me to suppose that they are strongly opposed to the system of sweating.

10214. Mr. Craig has given us evidence to the effect, as you say, that the manufacturers would wish to abate the evils of the sweating system if they could, but that they find great difficulty caused by the action of the Trades Union; is that your opinion?
That has been a very great difficulty. I can give you an instance. After the settlement of the great strike that took place in 1884 a minimum statement of wages was agreed to between the Trades Union and the Board appointed by the manufacturers. When this settlement was submitted to a mass meeting of the men it was repudiated; they preferred being as they were before. I am of opinion that had that statement been accepted the effect of it would have been to have dealt a terrible blow to the system of sweating; the Trades Union and the Board of Manufacturers would have combined and set their faces against any lower wages being paid than those agreed upon. Another difficulty, that I think arises from the action of the Trades Union is this: that when the manufacturers get the men into the workshop the Trades Union very often interferes with them, and that makes the manufacturers very averse to having the whole of their work done in their factories.

10215. Do you employ many society men in your firm?
Yes. We never ask the question whether they are society men or not, but I believe, as a matter of fact, most of my men are society men.

10216. Do you agree with the previous witnesses that it would be a good system if the work were entirely conducted in factories as far as practicable?
I think it would.

10217. And that these workshops or dwelling-rooms, where work is carried on for profit by more than one person, should be registered?
Yes, I am strongly in favour of that.

10218. Yours is the association of which Mr. Craig is the secretary?
Yes.

10219. What constitutes membership of the society?
When an application is made for membership it is considered by the committee, and if a man is respectable, has nothing against his character, he is admitted upon payment of a subscription.

10220. He must be a manufacturer, I suppose?
He must be a manufacturer, or engaged in some branch of the leather trade.

10221. How do you define a manufacturer?
A manufacturer is a man who makes for the wholesale trade or for export trade. A shoemaker I should define as a man having a retail shop and employing a few hand-sewn men.

10222. Have you any other suggestion that you wish to make to the Committee?
I think it only right to state here that the sweeping assertions that have been made in respect to the Jewish houses are hardly just. I have been associated with many of the Jewish manufacturers, and I have found them very honourable men.

10223. Are they members of your society?
Members of our society.

10224. Are any of them here?
Mr. Flatau is a member, a vice president; he is the only one here to-day, I think. And I have always found them, many of them, most ready to take part in any movement to ameliorate the condition of the workpeople. There are, of course, some very black sheep, as there are in every flock.

10225. How many men do you employ in your London factories?
I suppose from 300 to 500.

10226. Can you give the Committee any idea how many men would be employed by smaller manufacturers, without mentioning names?
The smallest, I should say, from 20 to 30.

10227. Would they be eligible for membership in your society?
Yes.

10228. The number of men employed by a man would have nothing to do with his being a member of your society?
That would have nothing to do with it.

10229. Earl of *Limerick.*] Are you aware how the sanitary inspectors are appointed at present?
They are appointed by the local authorities.

10230. Do you think that their being appointed, and also being removable, by the local authorities may in any case interfere with the strictness of their sanitary inspection?
I think so. I may say I have been a member of the Paddington Vestry for many years, but the work of the sanitary inspector has not been carried out to my satisfaction; not carried out so strictly.

10231. Perhaps you are not aware that it has been stated before this Committee that there are local influences which may in some instances prevent the sanitary inspector from properly performing his duties; is that your experience?
It is not my experience, but I should think it extremely probable, in some districts.

10232. Could you make any suggestion as to the appointment of the inspectors in future, so as to secure a more efficient carrying out of the Acts, especially if they are extended in any way?
I think that if they were appointed, as the factory inspectors are, I think by the Local Government Board (I am not quite sure as to that), independently of any local body, it might be an improvement.

10233. And only removed, I suppose, in case of fault?
Exactly.

10234. *Chairman.*] As I understand you, the manufacturer is a man who manufactures for export, or for the wholesale trade at home, and the shoemaker is a man whose business is entirely bespoke, to order?

Yes.

Yes. I may say, if you will permit me to add this, that as a shipper, one who ships goods largely for the colonies, I am under the impression that a minimum statement of wages, a fair rate of wages paid to the men generally, would not interfere with that trade to any appreciable extent.

10235. You find a larger demand now for the cheaper classes of goods for exportation than you had some years ago?
Our experience goes to prove that there is rather a better class of goods demanded. I may say also that I am largely in favour of the establishment of trade schools.

10236. Do you manufacture yourselves all classes of goods?
Yes.

10237. From the highest to the lowest?
Yes.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. JOHN BRANCH, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

10238. *Chairman.*] ARE you a Manufacturer?
Yes.

10239. Where is your place of business?
At 43, Bethnal Green-road, London; also in Melbourne, Australia.

10240. Do you manufacture in Melbourne?
No; I have a warehouse there.

10241. How long have you been in business?
About 20 years.

10242. How long have you had your establishment in Melbourne?
About two years.

10243. I presume that you export principally to Melbourne?
Yes. I manufacture all the goods in London that I send out to Melbourne, or nearly all.

10244. Where do you manufacture the rest?
I have the rest manufactured for me.

10245. What class of goods do you export?
The medium and best goods; and some few common goods which are manufactured for me.

10246. You do not manufacture the common goods?
Not the very common; it is principally light evening shoes which I do not manufacture, which are a common class of goods.

10247. Is it your experience that the general quality of the goods exported is inferior to what it used to be?
My experience, of course, is very limited. During the two years that I have had practical acquaintance with that branch of the trade there has been no reduction. I do not think from my observation that the class of goods are reduced at all during the last 10 or 12 years, I have had some knowledge of it.

10248. Have you been only exporting for two years?
Two years myself; but I have been acquainted with the trade for 20 years past, and come in contact with manufacturers, and especially during 10 years of that time I have been in close contact with the manufacturing body, as the honorary secretary of the association.

10249. The selling price of articles has largely diminished, has it not?
To the customer, yes. The price of leather has been reduced this last few years, and has fluctuated very considerably. I do not think that the price for labour has diminished, but there has been a certain improvement in the quality of the labour, that is to say, in its appearance, through the improvement of machinery, and closer attention being given by the manufacturer to the adapting of his material to the article required. More is done by machinery now than there used to be; and in addition to that, methods of manufacuturing are greatly improved.

10250. The cost to the consumer, you say, has diminished, and you account for that by a decrease in the price of material, and by improved methods in manufacture by machinery?
Yes.

10251. Not by any reduction of wages?
The changes that I have mentioned account for an improved article, but I do not think that the cost of labour has decreased at all; that is to say, that a man can earn as much now, and probably more, than at any other time, though the article perhaps has gradually improved over what it used to be.

10252. And you think also that for this diminished price the customer, in the colonies or at home, gets as good an article as he did?
Quite as good, and better; that is to say, better in appearance.

10253. You do not agree, then, with the witnesses who have stated that he at present gets a cheap and nasty article?
I do not agree that it is worse than it has been; I think it is improving at the present time, as far as my acquaintance with the trade is concerned, which I admit not to be very extensive; but I frequently come in contact with manufacturers who manufacture and send out this class of articles, and I am under the impression that, of the two, it is rather better now than it ever has been.

10254. As regards Melbourne, are foreign-made goods imported there largely, do you know?
I have a representative in Melbourne, and he tells me that the competition of continental goods is very formidable indeed as against the English-made goods.

10255. Would that be from Germany?
It would be from Germany and Austria, and France; Germany and Austria principally.

10256. The competition is formidable, you say?
Yes, very; more particularly in the better class of goods; in that class of goods where style is an important factor as against strength.

10257. Then would you be apprehensive of anything that tended to increase the cost of production in England?
I think that anything that tended to increase the cost of production in cheap labour would certainly be calculated to retard the colonial trade.

10258. Have you heard the evidence of the previous witnesses?
Yes.

10259. Do you generally agree with it?
In the main, with a certain few exceptions.

10260. Are you a member of the same society to which they belong?
I am the honorary secretary of the society, and have been connected with it ever since its formation.

10261. If you have any special point of difference, perhaps you would explain it to the Committee?

I might

I might say that I agree with the last witness's evidence with reference to the inspection of the houses or the places where this work is done, and the registration, as against that of Mr. Craig. I rather am of opinion that the sanitary inspector can do his duty better as a sanitary inspector than he could coupled with any other interest that he might have involved of a technical kind connected with the trade. I do not see the value of coupling the sanitary inspectorship with a technical knowledge of the work done. Beyond that, I should agree with stricter sanitary inspection, and also registration.

10262. Do you carry on your business in the main on the same lines as have been described to us by the former witnesses?
Just the same.

10263. Except that I understand you buy in some of the goods you export?
Those are very cheap evening shoes; as I have explained, they are the only things that we buy in.

10264. Earl of *Limerick.*] Do you think it important that the sanitary inspector should be made more independent of local influences?
I have not studied the question very largely, but I certainly should be in favour of the local inspector being free from any local influences as far as possible.

10265. Lord *Monkswell.*] Do you employ greeners?
No, I do not employ any what is called low-class labour at all. We work under the trades union regulations.

10266. Then you do not know what the wages of the most unskilled workmen are?
Only so far as it is brought before us in connection with a board of the association, in which we have to deal with all questions which are brought before us affecting labour. At that board we frequently have questions discussed which deal with labour quite outside my practical experience; on the board I come in contact with low-priced work.

10267. You know from what passes at the board that very low wages are given for certain work by certain men?
I may say that though I have been connected with the Board of Conciliation for the last 10 years, we never have had any questions brought before that board in which the prices for labour have been as low as those which have been brought before this Committee.

10268. Then do you think that the wage of the most unskilled work has gone down or not?
As far as that board gives evidence, which represents the working element in London, is concerned, I should say no.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. HENRY NEWMAN is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

10269. *Chairman.*] What is your business?
I am an Agent and Merchant, at 147, Aldersgate-street.

10270. Are you are a manufacturer?
No, not at all.

10271. Have you personal knowledge of the trade and its conditions?
Yes. I am the President of the International Journeymen Boot Finishers' Society.

10272. As I understand you, your business is that of an agent?
Yes.

10273. Have you anything you wish to state to the Committee?
I have a great deal to say; but as the time is very short I will give you only a few points. I have interested myself lately in the sweating system, and I have made inquiries. The society which elected me as its president was established the 1st of December 1886, with the object of supporting the members respectively, and their families, during the former's illness or on their decease; also for aid in slack time.

10274. You need not give us the objects of the society?
We have lately made it our chief object to abolish the sweating system by doing away entirely with the sweating dens, so getting in-door labour for our people instead of the present out-door labour.

10275. By "in-door labour," you mean in factories?
Yes, in factories. That principle getting known among the working people, has increased the number of our members greatly, so that in the last eight weeks we have enrolled about 200 new members. Some of our people are working at present in these factories, two of the employers being of the Jewish persuasion and one of the Christian. Also many others have promised to follow the example. The principle of in-door labour has also been recommended by the Boot Manufacturers' Association to their members.

10276. I understand that you think that the cure for the sweating system is that the hands should be employed in factories?
In-doors only.

10277. But how do you propose to bring that end about?
By manufacturers and working-men working hand-in-hand; and I think if the manufacturers are willing to employ their people in-doors, they can do it; because manufacturing actually means to make certain articles on the premises; but at the present time most of the work is done out-of-doors. For instance, the work is only clicked; that is, the uppers are cut in-doors and the machinery is done mostly out-doors, that is, the machinery of the uppers; the soles are cut certainly in-doors, but then the other work is all given out; lasting and finishing is mostly done out-of-doors. I do not want to say that in exceptional cases it is not done in-doors, because in large factories they employ some lasters in-doors; but mostly it is done out-of-doors; so that the greatest part of the work is done out-of-doors.

10278. How do you propose to manage that it should be done in-doors?
That the manufacturers should find room for the people in-doors.

10279. At present, of course, there is not sufficient accommodation for them?
They can make the accommodation, because they have at present accommodation for the other hands; they have accommodation for the clickers, the rough cutters, and the machinists sewing the soles on; they are mostly done in-doors.

10280. As I understand you, your objection is that the whole of the work should be conducted out-of-doors?
Yes.

10281. Is there any other point which you wish to bring before us?
Yes. I wish to say by whom that sweating system has been brought about. No other people but the sweating masters, and especially those employing many men, have been the medium by which the manufacturers have been able to grind down the wages from time to time, so that some of these manufacturers are paying at the present time starvation wages. I have taken the trouble of getting two statements of manufacturers paying very low wages and well known in the trade; they are also members of the Manufacturers' Association, and perhaps your Lordships will look at those.

10282. Do

10282. Do you mean that wages are lower now than they used to be?
This is a lower class of goods; but at the same time the wages are actually starvation wages.

10283. I ask you whether you say that the wages are lower now than they were?
For both the commoner and medium class, certainly.

10284. But not for the superior?
For the superior I do not think they are; because there has been a statement drawn up for the first class and second class, and that is kept on, and in case the manufacturers try to grind that down, the union would not let them, but would interfere.

10285. In the inferior classes the wages are lower than they were?
Yes; because there is no statement of prices at all.

10286. How much lower are they than they used to be?
A great deal lower in some instances. If you go to several houses you will find several statements. In one house the statement is a little higher, in another lower, and in another lower again, and so through that there is an unfair competition brought about. These people paying higher wages cannot compete with the others paying the lower.

10287. And I gather from you that you think there ought to be a regular statement for the inferior and lowest class of work?
Yes, certainly; there ought to be for all.

10288. How would you propose to bring that about?
If the manufacturers and working people would work hand-in-hand, not as at the present time, when the union cannot agree with the masters, I think that such a statement could be brought about; but if both sides cannot meet together and exchange their views it never can be done. For instance, if we could work hand-in-hand with the manufacturers we would come to the association, and if we found there as low statements as these which I have produced, we could lay them before the council, and ask them whether it is right that a manufacturer should pay such low wages.

10289. This is the copy of the statement you have handed in?
Yes.

10290. Who made the copy?
It was got from the people taking the work out, the sweater himself. The copy was made by our secretary.

10291. How do you know it is a correct one?
Because they have taken it from the books of the people employed at that firm.

10292. I see this gives the various prices per dozen at which various kinds of goods are to be made; then underneath I see this: "All machine; military heels;" and under that is written: "From above the working men get one-half, and the sweater master gets one-half"?
Yes, that is quite correct.

10293. Who has written that?
That was also written by our secretary, but I can give evidence on that. I will explain how that is done; how the masters work that principle, how they divide the wages; if your Lordship would allow me a little more time on another occasion.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Monday next, Eleven o'clock.

Die Lunæ, 23° Julii, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of DERBY.
Earl of ONSLOW.
Lord CLINTON.
Lord CLIFFORD OF CHUDLEIGH.
Lord FOXFORD (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord SANDHURST.
Lord MONKSWELL.
Lord THRING.

THE EARL OF ONSLOW, IN THE CHAIR.

MR. EVAN C. NEPEAN, C.B., is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

10294. *Chairman.*] You are, I believe, the Director of Army Contracts?
Yes.

10295. Will you tell us what public clothing is provided under the Government contracts which come under your knowledge?
The clothing for the whole of the Army and the Militia, the clothing for the Post Office employés and for the Telegraph employés, and the clothing for the Royal Irish Constabulary.

10296. And how is it made?
The clothing for the Army and the Militia is made in one of three ways: by manufacture in our own factory at Pimlico; by contract; or the cloth is sent to regiments and made up there by regimental artificers; this refers more especially to cavalry regiments.

10297. What is done with regard to the clothing for the Army in India?
The cloth for the regular Army in India is procured by us and delivered at Pimlico for inspection; it is then sent out to India by the India office, and made up there.

10298. You, of course, do not make up the clothing for the Army in India?
No.

10299. What is the principle upon which the material is bought?
All the cloth and materials for clothing, such as serge, tweed, &c., are bought by open contract. The cloth is inspected by the permanent inspectors and View Department at Pimlico, and is from thence distributed to the factory, to the contractors, or to the regiments, to be made up into clothing.

10300. Can you tell us what quantities you buy?
In the last three years the quantities of cloth, kersey, serge, tartans, and tweeds have amounted to an average of nearly 2,000,000 yards a year.

10301. After the material is bought, do you then send it either to your factory or to the contractors?
Yes.

10302. Then for all the Government clothing that is made, the materials are provided in the first instance by yourself?
Yes.

10303. And in no case does the contractor get his own materials?
Not for the Army and for the Militia, except for hospital garments and clothes for discharged soldiers.

10304. Can you tell us what is the number of hands employed at the Government factory now?

 I have

I have not got that information; but the approved number for Pimlico is 1,200 hands.

10305. Will you tell me is that a stationary quantity, or has it varied?
It was in former years a larger number, but the numbers have invariably varied with the wants of the Service; but that number was fixed in the year 1881 by the Secretary of State.

10306. Was it fixed with a view to meet the wishes of the trade, or in order to meet the requirements of the department?
It was in a great measure to meet the demands from the trade. The trade represented to the Secretary of State that in their opinion the Army Factory absorbed too large a proportion of the whole of the clothing; and Mr. Childers, who was then Secretary of State, went thoroughly into the matter, and decided that, roughly, in the future three-quarters of the clothing for the Army should be made in the factory, and that one-quarter should be obtained by contract.

10307. When you say that 1,200 are employed in the factory, is there any limit to the amount of work which those people may take home to their homes to do?
If you will allow me, I will ask you to direct questions of that description to the Director of Clothing, who is in charge of the factory. I am not in any sense responsible for it; all I am speaking on now is derived from the open official papers.

10308. Can you say whether any of the work is done off the premises by the persons employed?
The order is that outside hands are not employed, unless they be such hands as are regular inside hands, and who are away from temporary causes.

10309. Now I want to ask you about the Factory Clause; is the Factory Clause inserted in all your clothing contracts?
It is now in all our clothing contracts.

10310. Has that had the effect of entirely abolishing the outside hands in the trade?
To the best of our belief it is so.

10311. That is to say that, with the Factory Clause, it would be impossible for the ordinary sub-contractors and the sweaters we have heard so much of, to undertake the contract, and to comply with the terms of it?
No, they could not comply with the terms of it.

10312. Can you say now long ago the Factory Clause was introduced into your contracts?
It was the same year that the Secretary of State considered the question of the proportions of clothing which should be made by the trade and by the factory respectively. Up to that time outside hands had been employed at Pimlico; and, to get down to the 1,200 women authorised for that place, it was determined gradually to dispense with the outside hands. Then in order that the trade might compete on an equal footing with the factory, Mr. Childers introduced the Factory Clause into the contracts, which forbid them to employ outside hands.

10313. Then it was not in order to meet any evils in connection with the sweating system that that Factory Clause was inserted?
We were not aware at that time that those evils existed, and the matter was not considered in that light at all.

10314. Have there been any additions to the number of contracts or the class of contracts into which the Factory Clause is now inserted as against former times?
Yes; the Factory Clause has now been inserted into the contract for clothing the Post Office and Telegraph employés.

10315. When

10315. When was that?
That was done this year.

10316. At the commencement of the year; among the first contracts that were issued?
The contract for clothing is made once in three years; and in the spring of this year we were renewing it for another three years, and it was then introduced, at my instance, in consequence of the debate in the House of Lords upon which this Committee was appointed.

10317. Does the Factory Clause apply also to the slop clothing, which is not made at Pimlico?
That has been done only this year. The introduction of the Factory Clause into the slop clothing contracts is due to the revelations made here. In the first contract made this year, in January, it was not introduced, and not introduced on the ground which I have already stated, namely, that the origin of the Factory Clause was not connected with the sweating system, but with producing a fair competition between Pimlico and the trade; as Pimlico did not make slop clothing, so it was not necessary to introduce the Factory Clause into the contract; but in the second contract made this year, in May, that clause has been introduced, and with a view to stopping sweating.

10318. You said, I think, that the Royal Irish Constabulary clothing also was under you; is there a Factory Clause inserted in the contracts for that?
Yes; it has been inserted for the last two years.

10319. Was there any reason why, so long ago as two years, you put a Factory Clause into the Irish Constabulary contract, before the revelations made before this Committee were known?
I will, if you please, look into that and furnish an answer; I cannot answer it off-hand. I find that I was wrong; the factory clause was also introduced into this contract in 1888.

10320. It was not, as far as you recollect, because you thought the prices tendered were too low for good work?
No; because the Irish Constabulary clothing is, a good deal of it, delivered in materials, basted, and made up at the head-quarters of each district in Ireland.

10321. Does the clothing for the Volunteer forces come under you also?
No; that is provided by the officers commanding, out of the Capitation Grant?

10322. And you are not in any way responsible for it?
Not responsible at all for it.

10323. Therefore, whatever evidence we may have received respecting Volunteer clothing, and the way that it has been put out to sub-contractors, that would not have been done with the knowledge or with the wish of the Secretary of State for War?
Certainly not.

10324. Are you aware at all whether any great quantity of the Volunteer clothing is made in London?
Yes; there are four or five firms who get orders to a considerable extent. The Volunteer clothing lasts a good many years, and it is calculated, I think, that somewhere about 40,000 suits a year only are demanded; and looking at it in that light, I should say that a considerable proportion comes here. The practice of obtaining it in local centres is believed to be spreading; but I am not able to state how far those who take the contracts in local centres make it themselves, and how far they send it to London.

10325. Can you tell me what are the principal firms in London who make it?
Yes; their names are Messrs. Hebbert & Co., who have factories in Bethnal-green; Messrs. Pearse, whose place of business is in St. Martin's-lane; Messrs. Dolan,

Dolan, of Bond-street, Vauxhall; Messrs. Hobson, of Woolwich; and Messrs. Gardiner, of the Commercial-road.

10326. Do you know at all whether they have factories on their premises?
They, all of them, have factories where they make up clothing.

10327. Do you know at all whether the clothing is made up in their factories or outside?
I have seen most of them on the subject, and they inform me that they employ outside hands as well as making up the things in the factory; that they do what they can in their factory, but that they have outside hands also.

10328. And do they discriminate in any way work which they give out to the outside hands, and that which they make up on their own premises?
No, I have not heard anything of that kind.

10329. They do not, for instance, take the Volunteer clothing into their factories, and put the other work out?
No, I have not heard that they do; I do not think there is any discrimination whatever.

10330. In addition to the Volunteer clothing, is there any other Government clothing which you do not provide?
Yes; there is first the clothing for the Metropolitan Police, which, though paid partly out of the rates, is also paid out of the Consolidated Fund.

10331. Who is responsible for that?
That is under the Receiver of the Metropolitan Police. The contract is about to be renewed at the present time, and it has been arranged that the Factory Clause shall be inserted there. I have drafted a clause for the Receiver to fit into his contract, so that that may be done.

10332. What proportion of the clothing is paid out of the rates, and what proportion out of the Consolidated Fund?
I think it is half-and-half; I think that the Metropolitan Police is half supported by rates and half by the Consolidated Fund.

10333. Is there any other Government clothing which you do not provide?
The Custom House clothing for the officers, tide-waiters, and others, which is now in the hands of Messrs. Hebbert; that has not got the Factory Clause in; but the Custom House has given notice to terminate the contract, and I shall invite the Commissioners, if they see no objection, to put in the same clause as we have. There is the contract for the emyloyés of the Board of Trade, which is in the hands of Messrs. Dolan; in the same way I shall ask the officials there to include the Factory Clause in their next contract. And finally, there is the clothing for the convict prison warders and others; that used to be an important contract for making up clothing; but I find that the existing contract is confined to the purchase of the cloth, and that all the clothing is made up in the convict prisons by the prisoners.

10334. You are satisfied that none of that is put out?
Yes.

10335. Then if these clauses are put into all these contracts, will the result be that no Government clothing will be made except in factories?
Yes, with very few exceptions; and no doubt it can be made absolutely universal.

10336. Do you have the tenders for the clothing for the Metropolitan Police, the Custom House, the Board of Trade, and the convict prisons, through your hands?
No. All the tender forms except for the last, for warders, have been through my hands; but the tenders when received are adjudicated upon by the officers responsible.

10337. There

10337. There is a penalty, is there not, for a breach of the Factory Clause?
Yes; the penalty is 100 *l.*

10338. Have you ever estreated that penalty?
No.

10339. Have you any reason to believe that the clause has ever been violated?
We have never had any application made to us, or information regarding any particular case of violation. I have asked almost all our contractors, those at all events who are in London, and they assure me that they never have violated it themselves, and they do not think that other people have.

10340. There is considerable competition, is there not, for the Government contracts?
Yes.

10341. Would it not be probable that with so great a competition, if it was generally known in the trade that the Factory Clause was habitually broken, some of those who failed to receive the contract would give information against those who secured it?
I think it is extremely probable.

10342. But yet no such case has occurred?
No such case has occurred.

10343. To whom would the penalty go?
The penalty would go to the Crown.

10344. The whole of it?
Yes.

10345. Then it would not be the interest of the common informer to bring a case under the notice of the War Office, in the hope of getting some portion of the fine?
No.

10346. Has it ever occurred to you whether it would be a desirable thing to do to alter that state of affairs?
I will consider it; we have not considered it yet; we have not up to the present time, in any of our contracts with penalties, offered to share the penalty with the informer; but it is a matter which is deserving of consideration.

10347. Will you tell us further, in respect to the slop clothing; that, I understand, is not uniform?
No.

10348. But ordinary clothing, which is given to the discharged soldiers on their discharge?
Yes, that is so.

10349. Are they given an order upon the different firms, or do you issue from the store at Pimlico?
It is issued from the store at Pimlico, and sent to the quartermasters of the different regiments, who issue it to the discharged soldiers.

10350. What does it consist of principally?
There is a great-coat, I think, that the man has to buy if he wants; the jacket, waistcoat, and trousers are issued to him free.

10351. I suppose you introduce some diversity into the pattern and materials of this clothing, do you not?
It is diversified as much as possible. In issuing a tender for this clothing we require the contractors to send in varied samples, showing what they will supply; and they send in some, a good many, samples of different patterns of cloth, out of which they agree to make up this clothing.

10352. What firms take that clothing?
That has been taken by Messrs. Hyam & Co., who recently wound up; by Messrs. Webb, of Coleman-street, and lately by Messrs. Hollington, and the Auxiliary Forces Company.

10353. What is that?
That is a London company which works in Limerick.

10354. Will you tell us how the contracts for these great coats would be arranged; do you send a sample down to the manufacturer?
No; we call for tenders for so many great coats, and we fix the price in this particular instance at 12 *s.* 8 *d.*, as being the price that we think the soldier should pay for a great coat if he wants to buy one; and then we issue tenders to various firms, saying that we want them to send in samples of cloth and linings with which they will make up great-coats which are to cost 12 *s.* 8 *d.* each; and those samples are gone through by the technical officers at the Army Clothing Department, who inform me which of the firms gives the best value for money.

10355. Are the great-coats completely made up?
Completely.

10356. Then what is the next course after a tender has been accepted?
The contractor makes them up and sends them into store.

10357. And are they passed by the viewer?
By the inspector.

10358. And is it necessary that they should be exactly according to the sample that was given out?
They must be made from one or other of the samples of cloth deposited with the tender, and which we retain?

10359. Do you recollect the case of the great-coats that were made by Messrs. Hollington in this year?
Yes.

10360. How many were made by Messrs. Hollington?
One thousand five hundred.

10361. And at what price?
12 *s.* 8 *d.*

10362. Do you recollect the samples that were sent in by Messrs. Hollington?
We have the samples at Pimlico now.

10363. Do you know how many there were?
Twenty-three of cloth.

10364. And when the great-coats came in, after they were made, did you see the viewer and hear anything from him about them?
No.

10365. You merely knew that he had passed them?
I assume, in the absence of complaints, and in the absence of report of any default, that they are delivered and paid for?

10366. Since this evidence has been given before this Committee, have you made any inquiry?
No.

10367. You have had the evidence, I think; have you seen the allegations that were made by Mr. Price?
No; I have not seen them.

10368. Then I will read that part of his evidence to you. Mr. Price, in answer to Question 4130, said: "We had a large contract in the house where I was employed, 400 Government coats for discharged soldiers; they get these coats

coats presented to them on their discharge. We paid 3 *s.* 6 *d.* or 4 *s.* 6 *d.* (I forget which, but my impression is that it was 4 *s.* 6 *d.*) on making a sample, but when the bulk came in we paid 2 *s.* (*Q.*) I do not quite understand? (*A.*) The sample that had to go to Pimlico, to the Government factory, to be examined for this contract for the 400, was of superior cloth and of superior make; but when the bulk of the 400 were given out, they were given out at 2 *s.* each, with inferior cloth and inferior lining." Have you any reason to suppose that that is accurate?

No; I should say on the face of it that it was impossible. It looks as if the person who gave evidence was unaware that there had been more than one sample.

10369. Mr. Hollington, in answer to Question No. 9491, says: "When invited to tender, a sealed sample or samples are laid before the contractor in the pattern-room at Pimlico; attached to each garment you find a label specifying full particulars; to these all houses sending in tenders are expected to adhere. Garments are sometimes sent up simply to show any suggested improvements, but have no bearing upon the contract; and, in fact, a 42 *s.* coat might be sent to show an improvement that could be introduced into one at 13 *s.*" That is Mr. Hollington's explanation of the allegations made by Mr. Price; do you think it is likely to be a correct one?

I think when he refers to a sample great coat, he forgets that the sample great coat is only to govern shape and make, and that it is not to govern material, but it is to fix, to certain extent, the value of the coat.

10370. And, therefore, that a sample might have been sent in by Messrs. Hollington saying, "We can make you a coat of this pattern, but of another material," and Mr. Price having seen that coat go in may have thought that the coats which were finally made for the tender were not in accordance with the samples sent?

Clearly. I think there are several explanations of it. One is this, that in the varied samples we get there is a variation in the value; it is understood that Messrs. Hyam, and Messrs. Hollington since, are able to make up this class of clothing from remnants of cloth. We get a much greater diversity of patterns in consequence of that. It follows, therefore, naturally that some of the great coats will be of greater value than others, but all of them are believed to be up to the 12 *s.* 8 *d.*

10371. Were the 1,500 coats that were made up by Hollington the whole of the contract?

No; there were 4,000 great coats altogether.

10372. And who made up the balance?

Messrs. Hammond, of Newcastle-under-Lyme, 1,500; Messrs. Webb, 500; Auxiliary Forces Company, 500.

10373. Did you have any reason to be dissatisfied with any of the coats that came in?

No; no report reached me against any of them.

10374. Would it be possible to introduce the Factory Clause into the slop-clothing contracts?

That has already been done since then. That contract was dated the 20th of January 1888, and in the next competition, which was in May, I think, of this year, we introduced the Factory Clause.

10375. And what firms have taken that contract?

Messrs. Hollington have taken a part of it, and the Auxiliary Forces Company the rest.

10376. Messrs. Hollington, we were given to understand, have no factory in London?

They have filled in a factory at Bury St. Edmunds in the tender paper. In each tender paper the contractor has to mention where he intends to make the articles, and in this case they have filled in Bury St. Edmunds.

10377. Do you ever follow up the contracts at all; do you ever send down

to the factories that are filled in, to see whether the work is being done in them or not?

Generally speaking we have inspected the factories before we have entertained any offer; in fact, if a new contractor came to us to-morrow, and said, "I want to make your clothing in such and such a factory," we should send and inspect the factory before we accepted the tender. I do not think anything has been done in regard to that at Bury St. Edmunds; because that factory happens to have been the factory of Messrs. Hyam before Messrs. Hollington.

10378. Do you not in any way follow up the clothing to see whether it is being done in the factory?

No, we have no means of doing that. The factories are subject to the inspection of the Home Office under the Factory Act.

10379. Are you in communication with the Home Office in regard to the clothing?

No.

10380. Then the factory inspector has no authority from you to see whether the clothing is being made up in the factory or not?

I do not think anybody could see exactly whether that was being done. For instance, he would have to take into consideration the number of yards of cloth in the possession of the firm, and to call for a return of all the garments on the spot in their semi-manufactured state. It would clearly be a long job, and I do not see how it could be carried out except by an expert.

10381. It does not occur to you that there is any possibility of maintaining inspection over the factory during the time that the contract is being carried out in it?

Not with a view of seeing that nothing is taken out.

10382. Can you inform the Committee what garments were contracted for in 1885, 1886, and 1887?

Yes. In 1885 we contracted for 1,085,850 garments.

10383. Was that considerably in excess of the normal requirements?

Very much so, indeed.

10384. On what account?

In consequence of the second expedition to the Nile, the Suakin-Berber Expedition, and the threatened war with a Continental Power; all of which caused very large expenditure upon clothing and stores.

10385. And were they required at a comparatively short notice?

At very short notice.

10386. And therefore you were not specially careful as to the places where they were made, or as to whether the contracts contained a factory clause?

At first we started with the factory clause in all our contracts, but when the want became urgent we left out the factory clause, but gave preference to those who could make the garments up in their factory.

10387. In fact it comes to this, does it not, that for the normal requirements of the War Department, the houses with factories are sufficient for the purpose?

Certainly.

10388. But when you get an extra pressure, it would not be possible for you to insist absolutely on the work being done in factories?

Quite so.

10389. Will you go on to say the numbers in 1886 and 1887?

In 1886 we only bought 153,650 garments; in 1887 we bought 330,382.

10390. Can you say what proportion of those garments were made in London?

In 1886 we only got of the better garments 8,000 in London, besides 13,000 hospital garments, the serge and materials for which are bought by the contractor.

tractor. In 1887 we made up 24,700 garments of the first class, and 56,000 capes for great coats, in London, out of the whole.

10391. Can you tell us at all what proportion, roughly speaking, of the whole value of the army clothing is made by contract in London?

At present very little indeed. At the present moment the only work being done for us is these capes for great coats, and a few trousers. The proportion now is in value, I should think, about 1,000 *l.* a year.

10392. Out of how many thousands?

£. 20,000 a year is the allowance.

10393. And is that a fair standard a year?

No. The competition in the provinces is increasing in keenness. One factory at Newcastle-under-Lyne has reduced its prices very materially.

10394. We have had a good deal of evidence before this Committee in respect to sweating in the making of accoutrements and harness for the army, but the evidence upon that is not yet completed; the Committee are expecting to receive further evidence upon it, and therefore I will not go into it in detail; I will merely ask you whether you have read the evidence which has been given so far, and whether you are doing anything in order to meet the evils that have been complained of?

I have read a great portion of the evidence that has been given upon this subject, and I have received the authority of the Secretary of State to go thoroughly into it in the recess, with the view of endeavouring to lay down a price list which shall govern all the minor operations in making harness, saddlery, and accoutrements.

10395. And do you believe that that could be done and made the basis of future tenders?

I think so. I have already consulted with certain of the masters, and also with some others who are interested in it; and I think it is quite possible to arrive at a list which will be mutually satisfactory to master and to workpeople.

10396. Through whom does the clothing for the servants at Sandhurst and Blackwater pass?

That comes through me.

10397. Do you know by whom that work has been done?

That has recently been done by Messrs. Webb of Coleman-street, who make it in their factory at Dod-street.

10398. Mr. Price, in his evidence at Question 4139, was asked by the Chairman whether he knew if there was anything like favouritism or any bribery in giving out orders from Pimlico, and he said, "Yes, it is carried on to a great extent in the wholesale line." Then he is asked, "Perhaps you will explain?" and his answer is, "When I was in my position, if you gave out work to a certain man, the more you gave him the more compensation you had if you liked to take it." I understand that to be an allegation that certain firms may get the job from Pimlico if they can pay a sufficiently high price to the person who has the giving of it out; is there any truth in that?

That cannot be. Tenders are issued to every firm in our list; when received, they go through at least six hands in my office before I see them, and then they are jointly adjudicated upon by myself and the Director of Clothing.

10399. So that you say it would be absolutely impossible that any person could be bribed to give the work to one firm rather than to another?

Yes, if that refers to contracts, but I am not clear that it does.

10400. Supposing this has reference to work given to hands off the premises?

It must have reference to some past period, when work was given out from Pimlico to firms off the premises.

10401. Which no longer is done?
That no longer exists.

10402. Have you any knowledge of the Form which it is alleged, in answer to Question 1317, is given out by the contractor to the sweater or sub-contractor, in the following terms: "I, the undersigned, hereby agree, in the event of army, police, or railway clothing being entrusted to [ ], residing at [ ], for the purpose of being made up, to hold myself responsible to Messrs." (So and So), "for the safety of the garments"?
No.

10403. If such an agreement exists, would it not appear to show that it is the practice to put out army clothing off the factory premises?
Yes, it appears so.

10404. You have no knowledge of such a system?
No knowledge whatever.

10405. Did you see the evidence which Mr. Arnold White handed in to the Committee, a copy of one of those forms?
Not recently. I have not got it in my mind at all.

10406. You have nothing to say about that?
Nothing.

10407. You are not able to say whether it is the case or not?
It has never been brought to our notice.

10408. Lord *Thring.*] I understood you to tell the Chairman that some great coats on the same contract were of greater value than others; I did not quite catch what you meant?
I said that the coats were made up of a variety of materials and from remnants, and therefore it would follow that certain great coats might be made of more valuable material than others.

10409. In other words certain great coats on the same contract would be of more value than others?
Yes.

10410. But then are any of those great coats of greater value than the samples?
I should take it so, if you are referring to the sealed pattern.

10411. And others of less value than the samples?
No, I think not. In making the selection the inspector keeps the value of the sample in his eye; he does not object to anything that is superior, but he would object to anything manifestly inferior.

10412. Do I understand you to say that in your judgment when this large number of great coats came in, a considerable number were of greater value than the sample, and all up to the sample?
I was speaking hypothetically; as a possible explanation of Mr. Price's remark, I said it was a possible explanation; that they must vary in value is manifest, if the samples are different.

10413. But why should the samples be different on the same contract?
Because we do not want to issue a uniform great coat, but civilian great coats, as unlike each other as possible.

10414. But the great coats going to be sold to discharged soldiers, are those great coats of different values?
They would be made of different patterns of cloth.

10415. But do you say that they are of different values; you told the Chairman some were of greater value than the others; therefore in discharged soldiers' great-coats some would be of greater value than others?
Yes.

10416. How

10416. How do you distinguish them when you sell them?
They all go out on the basis of 12 *s.* 8 *d.*, what they cost us exactly.

10417. Then I understand you to say that although some great-coats are of greater value than the others they are all up to sample; therefore it is a sort of gift on the part of the manufacturer if he makes some of greater value?
He makes them of remnants which he uses up, and can afford to use up at that price.

10418. I understand you to say he does make great-coats of greater value than he need?
Yes, it is possible.

10419. And that, without distinction, you sell these great-coats at the same price to the soldier?
Yes.

10420. Therefore one man gets a better bargain than another?
Yes.

10421. Who is responsible for the passing of these great-coats?
The Director of Clothing.

10422. You are not responsible whether they are good or bad?
No.

10423. Then what did you mean when you said that you had no bad reports about them?
Because the Director of Clothing would bring to my notice any bad default of any contractor.

10424. Do you mean that he does not reject them himself?
Yes, he rejects them; but he would bring it to my notice if there was a bad execution of a clothing contract.

10425. Is the Director of Clothing or the viewer responsible?
The Director of Clothing is responsible, and the viewer is under him.

10426. He is his servant?
He is his servant.

10427. Then you said that the sample does not govern the material; I do not understand that; what does govern the material?
The samples which are sent in with the tender.

10428. Then I think I did not understand your answer; I took it down that the sample does not govern the material?
The standard pattern at Pimlico, the sealed pattern, is shown for make and style, and tenders are invited to that; but in consequence of our wishing for diversity of patterns, each contractor is invited to send in samples of the cloths that he will use; hence it is that the cloths that he sends with his tender become *pro hac vice* the sealed samples for material.

10429. How are they really distinguished, and who is responsible for them?
They are sealed in the Inspection Branch, under the Director of Clothing.

10430. Then there again, with respect to the same description of great-coats, some are made of a better material and some of a worse, according to the sealed sample being better or worse?
Yes.

10431. And how do you price them?
We fix that price, 12 *s.* 8 *d.*, ourselves.

10432. Whether they are better or worse?
Yes.

10433. Then I do not understand the object of having this difference of quality?

Simply because we must have different patterns of garments; we do not want to give a uniform coat.

10434. Why not a uniformly good one instead of a certain number of bad ones?
It is not that; it is that we want a civilian great coat.

10435. But why should you sell a coat of better material at the same price as a coat of worse material?
We leave it to the contractor; if the contractor could send us in half-a-dozen identical patterns of equal value, no doubt he would.

10436. You surely do not leave it to the contractor to determine whether he shall give you bad or good materials?
He cannot give us bad material; if he did, all his samples would be rejected.

10437. Is there a minimum degree of quality that you do not sink below?
There is a minimum below which the inspector will not pass anything.

10438. And what is the largest difference between the prices of the minimum and the maximum that you ever get?
I could not tell you. The man sends in a sample and he is compelled to abide by it, and the inspector is content.

10439. You yourself do not care what the quality is, then; a man sends in three or four samples?
It must be a quality that will satisfy our inspectors.

10440. What is the differential value between the best quality and the lowest quality that he will accept?
That I must request your Lordships to ask the inspector.

10441. Lord *Monkswell.*] You used the phrase, "open contract;" what does open contract mean?
Advertised competition.

10442. Do you pay a greater price in consideration of the insertion of the Factory Clause in these contracts?
No, I think not; there are factories in the country which are able to take a great portion of our contracts, and the prices are exceedingly low.

10443. With regard to these sample great coats that are said to have been sent in, I suppose the workmanship of the coats that are made must be as good as the sample, although the material may be different?
Yes.

10444. So that if a witness comes here and says that any contractor made a great coat of which the workmanship was worse than the sample sent in, in that case, if his evidence is correct, the coat ought not to have been passed?
The coats must be equal in workmanship to the standard pattern, and is judged by that alone.

10445. What do you include in the word "garments"?
Garments made of cloth, kerseys, serge, tartan, or tweed.

10446. Not including socks?
No.

10447. Is the Inspector of Clothing in any respects under you, or have you any authority over him?
I have no authority over him whatever.

10448. Supposing that, in your opinion, any thing had been wrongly passed or rejected, what should you do?
If articles have been wrongly rejected, the contractor has an appeal to me against the inspector's opinion, and I should thereupon consult with the Director of Clothing, and the Director of Clothing would furnish me with full information on the subject.

10449. Then

10449. Then you are the court of ultimate appeal with regard to the improper rejection of contracts?
Yes.

10450. Have you ever had any reason to suppose that there is anything in the nature of a ring to keep out work done by certain persons or certain corporations?
A ring at the inspection department do you mean?

10451. Yes, at the inspection department?
No.

10452. Lord *Thring.*] Would you explain the exact nature of the limits of your responsibility, You are not responsible, as I understand, for the quality of the clothing, and you are not responsible for the garments being passed; would you explain what are the limits of your responsibilty when you make a contract, say for 40,000 coats?
I receive from the Director of Clothing a paper showing the number of garments he wants and the number of the pattern, and of the specification guiding the supply. It is then my duty to call for tenders from those most capable of making them, and to fix the terms and conditions under which supplies are to be made; for instance, such a question as introducing the Factory Clause would be within my province. After I receive the tenders, my branch puts them into a shape in which they can be adjudicated upon, and I, with the Director of Clothing, allot the contract to the person most fit to perform it.

10453. When you say you adjudicate the contract, are you responsible for the price?
Yes.

10454. You solely, or the Director also?
I have to carry the Director with me; but I am responsible.

10455. You are responsible to the Government if too high a price is paid for the 40,000 great-coats; you consider yourself responsible for it?
Yes.

10456. But you are not responsible for the accurate fulfilment of the contract; that the Director of Clothing is responsible for?
The Director of Clothing would inspect, and in the event of having reason to find fault with the contractor he would report to me.

10457. Supposing no step is taken by anybody, you are not bound yourself to take any steps to ascertain whether the contract has been fulfilled or not?
Yes, I do take general steps every year to see how all important contracts have been fulfilled; but I should not take particular steps myself, but wait in each case for reports from the inspector.

10458. I will assume that you have made a contract for 40,000 great-coats; I will assume that you have fixed the price of the 40,000 great-coats; now supposing those 40,000 great coats are returned into store, and neither the Director of Clothing nor anybody else makes any complaint whatever to you with respect to those great-coats, is not your duty performed without your looking at them at all?
Yes.

10459. You are only a Court of Appeal with regard to the fulfilment of the contract?
Yes.

10460. But you do not yourself take any steps to see that it is properly performed?
No.

10461. *Lord Sandhurst.*] You say when an order comes for 40,000 great-coats, you go into the open market and put out tenders for it?
Yes.

10462. Then do you take the lowest tender?
We should first of all inquire how the contractor who made the lowest tender had done the last order entrusted to him; that would be the first thing we should ask. Then if we found that it had been satisfactorily fulfilled, we should take his tender.

10463. Have you any limit as to price, particularly as to low price?
We know by the balance sheet what the price of producing most garments in our own factory is, and we should compare the price offered by the contractor with our own price, in order to see that it was fair and reasonable.

10464. And therefore you might be paying a higher price than you could get it done for by tender by open competition?
Yes.

10465. *Chairman.*] Without restriction, you mean?
Without restriction.

10466. Lord *Sandhurst.*] Can you form any idea what such a difference is to the country?
No, I cannot; but, in fact, I do not think we should pay higher.

10467. *Chairman.*] Do the contractors who take the Government contracts take work in their factories, and use the factories all the year round, when they have no Government contract on hand?
So I understand.

10468. Do you know whether their factories are generally fully occupied?
I do not think that they are; I do not think that any of these contractors have work sufficient to keep their factories at full swing during the whole year.

10469. Then do you think that they keep their factories mainly in order to be able to secure the Government contracts?
No, I do not think so. Many of them prefer working in factories.

10470. I suppose a large contract would take the entire time of a factory?
A contract like the Post Office contract would take the entire time.

10471. And therefore any work, previously done by the factory, would in such a case be given out to the sweaters?
Yes.

10472. And therefore it comes to the same thing, whether the Government work is done in the factory, and the private work given out to sweaters, or the private work done in the factory, and the Government work given out to sweaters?
I am afraid it comes to the same thing as regards the workers.

10473. All that the Government, therefore, can do is to have a clear conscience itself; that, at any rate, no Government work is done in that way.
Yes.

10474. And that, you believe, in the future will be the universal rule.
I hope that before this Committee meet next Session, I shall have been able to inform myself as to the circumstances under which every item of a soldier's clothing and accoutrements, from his head to his foot, is prepared, and that I shall have been able, as far as anybody can be able, to prevent the application of what is called the sweating system to any one of the things that we buy.

10475. I think

10475. I think you said that many of these contracts were taken in factories in the provinces?
Yes.

10476. Has the effect of the Government clause in the contracts been to drive the trade into the country?
I think that it has encouraged the trade going into the country; I know it has.

10477. And therefore the workers in London would be the sufferers by that clause?
I am afraid so.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. WILLIAM JOHN COMPTON is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

10478. *Chairman.*] WHAT is your business?
I am in the firm of J. Compton and Sons, Army and Police Clothing Contractors.

10479. Are you the firm of Compton & Co., who were mentioned by Mr. Lyons in his evidence at Question 1923, in which he says that you are one of the four contractors who take Government work?
I presume we are.

10480. And what Government work do you take?
We have had the contract for the Metropolitan Police Clothing for the last 10 years.

10481. Do you give it out to sweaters?
Never.

10482. None at all?
Not one garment.

10483. Have you a factory?
Yes, we have two.

10484. Where?
At Crewe in Cheshire, and at Swindon in Wiltshire.

10485. And do you send your Metropolitan Police clothing to be made up there?
Yes.

10486. Lord *Sandhurst.*] All?
All; the tunics are made at Crewe and the trousers at Swindon.

10487. *Chairman.*] Mr. Lyons brought with him a coat, which he showed to the Committee, and which he said had been put out to a sweater; was that put out by your firm?
Certainly not.

10488. You say that you do not, and never have, put out any work to sweaters?
We never have.

10489. Does it cost you more to make clothes on your factory than it would in putting them out to sweaters?
I do not consider that it does.

10490. Why not?
I consider that with the modern appliances and improved machinery, the pressing machines and button-hole machines, sewing machines, tacking machines, even machines for putting on buttons, in every way facilitate the production of work in a cheap manner.

10491. And do you say that with ample machinery you could produce the work for a price as low as, if not lower than, that of the small sweater?
I am quite confident that we can produce our work at as low rates as if we had given it out to sweaters; the people working from eight in the morning till six in the evening, with one hour for dinner.

10492. Mr. Hawes, who is the Manager of the Working Women's Co-operative Association, informed the Commitee that factories were being given up because they did not pay; "because they cost so much money to keep them going;" is that in accordance with your experience?
No.

10493. Would it be possible to establish a factory in London which would pay?
I do not believe it would be possible to establish a factory at the present moment that would pay; because you would have to be prepared, perhaps, in establishing a new business to lose money for 10 or 12 years.

10494. Would that be on account of the higher wages paid to London workers than to country workers?
It would be impossible to obtain contracts. I mean that a firm that has been established for 30 or 40 years, having plenty of work on hand, contracts from all parts of the globe coming in every day, can make a factory pay, where a new firm would find it impossible to do so.

10495. Is the rate of wages in the country as high as in London?
I should think the rate of wages in London is as low as it is anywhere.

10496. And therefore you do not agree with the witnesses who believe that the factories would not pay in London?
No.

10497. You see no reason against them, except that the contractor would not have a connection?
He would not have sufficient work; he must be prepared to lose money for years before he established a connection in the contract trade.

10498. Is there a Factory Clause in the police contract you are now executing?
There is not.

10499. But you make it up in your factories in the country?
Yes.

10500. And, therefore, if a Factory Clause were put in, it would not affect your case, because the work would be done in the same way as you do it now?
Yes. I suggested it myself the last time it was put up for tender; but the police authorities thought it might affect the competition, and declined to put it in.

10501. Did you hear the statement of the last witness, that the police contract in future would contain the Factory Clause?
I am aware it is so.

10502. Do the people who work in your factory take work home after the work hours?
No; that is prohibited.

10503. You mean that it is prohibited by your orders; but does it ever occur?
It never occurs.

10504. Then you would be in favour of the policy which we understand the War Office are about to carry out, that in all Government contracts it should be stipulated that the clothing should be made on the premises?
Yes. They have had that clause in the War Office contracts for years; but they

they have never insisted upon it. There was a contract that was given out within the last six weeks to a house that has no factory.

10505. Neither in London nor in the country?
Neither in London nor in the country; that is my belief.

10506. And no penalty was enforced for the breach of that Factory Clause?
The contract has not yet been executed.

10507. Can you give the name of that firm?
No; I would rather not.

10508. You have never known, I suppose, of the penalty for the breach of the Factory Clause being estreated?
No.

10509. And yet you have known of cases where it has been violated?
Yes.

10510. There is a great deal of competition, is there not, for these contracts?
Frightful competition with us.

10511. How is it that it has not been your interest to give information to the War Office that the Factory Clause has been violated?
We do not like to speak against our competitors.

10512. Do you mean that, notwithstanding the strength of the competition, there is a feeling amongst the wholesale clothiers that they will allow an unfair advantage to be taken of them without making any complaint of it?
Well, I will not say that; but we should not like to make a public complaint of a competitor.

10513. But is not the Factory Clause a restriction of competition?
Yes.

10514. And yet you have no objection to firms carrying contracts out subject to a restriction which they do not obey, and you have never taken any steps to make complaint to the War Office?
I expect we have mentioned it over and over again to the officials, but we never made a formal complaint.

10515. You say you expect you have mentioned it; in what way do you mean?
In the course of conversation.

10516. Then you allege that the War Department are, and must have been, aware that the Factory Clause was habitually violated?
Yes.

10517. Have you anything more you wish to add to your evidence?
I should like to say that I am quite in sympathy with the object that the Committee has in view. My firm has been established for 35 years, and we have never adopted this sweating system. My father, I believe, was the first in the trade to establish a factory, 30 years ago, and since then all our work has been made in factories, except garments such as West-end tailors would make, special garments such as superintendents' clothes, and special things that cannot be made in factories. They are not given out to sweaters, but they are given out to first-class workmen to make at their own homes; but those garments are not one in a thousand in the number that we make.

10518. It has been suggested before the Committee by several witnesses that the premises upon which work is made should be registered; would you be in favour of that?
I think that all workshops should be registered; workshops in which any person is employed for wages.

10519. And where should the register be kept?

I should think the register should be kept locally, and there should be a large number of additional inspectors appointed.

10520. Would the object that you have in view in having registration be in order that the work people might know whether they were working in a registered workshop or not?
That would be a reason.

10521. Would another reason be in order that the Factory Inspector might know where to go?
Yes.

10522. Would it be difficult, do you think, for the contracting firm to be bound to keep a register themselves of all the places to which they put out work?
No, I do not think it would; I think that a good suggestion.

10523. And that they should be liable to a heavy penalty for putting out work at any workroom or workshop which was not registered, and the particulars of which were not kept upon their premises?
Yes.

10524. As a large manufacturer of clothing, you would view such a suggestion with favour?
I certainly should.

10525. Do you think that if a portion of the fine which may be estreated for breach of the Factory Clause were to be given to the informer, it would have the effect of bringing this breach to the notice of the War Office more frequently?
No, I do not like that system of giving the money to informers.

10526. How do you suggest that the War Office should be made acquainted with what, I understand you to say, is an habitual practice, but of which the War Office declare that they know nothing?
I expect the War Office know all about it.

10527. Then if they say that they do not know about it, and believe that the Factory Clause is never violated, you say that they say that which must be untrue?
Yes.

10528. Lord *Thring*.] Your factory, I presume, is a very large one?
It is a large one.

10529. How many men do you employ?
We employ about 950 hands in our two factories.

10530. When you say that you can compete with the sweaters, it is owing, I presume, to the largeness of your way of business which enables you to make goods much cheaper than you would if you were in a small way of business?
To the improved appliances that we adopt.

10531. That involves necessarily a larger expenditure of capital?
Yes.

10532. Therefore, in other words, a large capital can compete with very small men, but small men necessarily become sweaters if they wish to compete with large capital; that is the result?
I think not; I think a moderate sized factory can be conducted on similar principles if the manufacturer has sufficient enterprise.

10533. You said it would take 10 or 12 years to get into the contract business completely, and that it necessarily involved a considerable loss of capital; therefore does it not follow that it is a question between large capitals and small

small capitals; that large capitals can compete, but that the smaller capitals probably could not compete?

In starting a new concern entirely it would be so.

10534. Lord *Sandhurst.*] I think you said that the wages in London are lower than in the country?

I did not say that they were lower; I said that in my opinion they were not lower in the country than in London.

10535. But I suppose the rent that you pay for your factories is lower than it would be in London?

It is lower. That is a small item, because a factory in London would be in a cheap neighbourhood.

10536. Lord *Clinton.*] You do give out some work, as you said, though a very small quality?

A very small quantity of the best class work, such as an ordinary West-end tailor would make.

10537. Is that bespoke work?

Yes, all bespoke.

10538. Do you know where that work is done?

Yes.

10539. You know the houses of the people who do it?

Yes.

10540. Then do you let it out to a contractor?

No; we deal with the individual workmen in such cases.

10541. You know exactly who is employed upon it?

Yes, exactly.

10542. Men and women?

Men only.

10543. You employ women, I suppose, in the factory?

In the factory nine-tenths are women.

10544. Both at Swindon and Crewe?

Yes.

10545. How are they paid?

They are paid by the piece.

10546. Lord *Monkswell.*] You say that a moderate-sized factory would pay, what amount of capital do you suppose it would require to set up a factory large enough to pay?

It is not the factory itself that would pay; the question is whether you can get remunerative work to keep it going.

10547. You mean that the man would have to stand out of his money for a good many years, and consequently it would be rather a speculative and an expensive job to set up a factory until he had got a large connection?

Yes.

10548. Do you say that that is the same in the country as it is in London?

I think they have more enterprise in the North of England; they establish larger concerns there, but not in this particular class of trade. In the slop clothing trade generally, not in the uniform clothing trade, large factories are established in the North of England, and they manage to keep them going, and I suppose they pay well, for they send travellers all over the country.

10549. Do you know many instances of men successfully setting up a factory without beginning with any large capital, and without beginning with a connection?

No; I suppose the factory follows the connection.

10550. How would a man first get a connection?
He would probably get his work sweated.

10551. He must begin by being a sweater, or rather by employing sweaters?
I suppose so.

10552. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Is it a difficult thing to know whether a contractor has got a factory?
No.

10553. Therefore the authorities of the Clothing Department could with very little trouble discover whether the contractor they were giving work to had a factory or not?
No trouble at all.

10554. When were these two factories of yours established at Swindon and Crewe?
That at Crewe was established 25 years ago, and that at Swindon 18 years ago.

10555. And had you any particular object in establishing them at those two centres of railway work?
Yes; we have had for the last 30 years contracts for the uniforms for the London and North Western and the Great Western Railway Companies, and the directors asked us to establish factories, to find employment for the surplus female labour in those centres.

10556. There were facilities for the employment of female labour; the wives and daughters of the railway servants?
The wives and daughters of the artizans employed by the companies.

10557. And I think you said that the proportion of female labour was very large in these factories?
Nine-tenths at least.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. JOSEPH GEORGE PLUM, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

10558. *Chairman.*] Are you the Manager of the Military Outfitting Department of the Army and Navy Co-operative Society?
I am.

10559. The Committee were informed by a witness of the name of M'Leod that it was the practice of the Army and Navy Stores, who have a large factory, to employ men there and to keep them without work for a great period of the day, while at the same time they were putting out work to sweaters; have you anything to say upon that?
With reference to that point, like all West-end firms, the Society has a slack season, and during that period there is not sufficient work for all the men; therefore they may have to wait after finishing one garment before another is ready for them.

10560. That one can quite understand; but the question I was going to ask you was, is it, or is it not the fact that all the time that these men are standing idle there is work which might be given to them, but which is given out to sweaters; their names are given to the Committee, Mr. Marks and Mr. Wilkie?
We do not admit that we employ any sweaters. A portion of our work certainly goes to Mr. Marks and Mr. Wilkie, whose men earn very good wages; I have had the opportunity of conferring with several of them, and they inform me that they are perfectly satisfied with what they receive; in fact, that they earn very good weekly wages.

10561. How

10561. How many men do you employ in the busy time of the year?
From 96 to 120.

10562. And in the slacker portion of the year?
About 50.

10563. Is it a fact that Marks has received 190 *l.* in wages in the first 10 weeks of this year, which is the worst part of the year for employment?
We have gone through the total year's wages for the last year, and we find that Marks received in the 12 months 1,140 *l.* 7 *s.* 9 *d.*, or an average weekly rate of 21 *l.* 18 *s.* 7 *d.*

10564. What I asked you is this: is it a fact that you paid Marks 190 *l.* in the first 10 weeks of this year?
I could not say that.

10565. Are you the managing director who admitted this to Mr. M'Leod; Mr. M'Leod in his evidence, at No. 8188, says, "When we came to investigate the amount of work received by the coat-making sweater, Marks, it was admitted by the managing directors;" I presume that means yourself?
No; I am the manager of the department.

10566. "That he had received 190 *l.* wages in the first 10 weeks of the year, which would be the worst part of the year for employment"?
I do not remember admitting anything of the kind.

10567. You say it is not true?
I do not remember it at all.

10568. Do you remember his receiving anything at that time?
Yes; but I have not got it out in sections in that way.

10569. Did you have a deputation from the men?
I did.

10570. And did the men inform you that they were kept without work while they saw the work being given out to sweaters?
As taken down at the time, the deputations' request was as follows: first, they would like to see the workshops full, and no work given out to outside hands, especially to Messrs. Marks and Wilkie. The directors' reply was, that they could not promise that, as the men in the busy season had refused to do certain work; therefore it was necessary that we should employ outside hands.

10571. What class of work is that that they refused to do?
Principally servants' clothes, drill garments, and stock overcoats for the ready-made department.

10572. And those you had to give out?
Yes.

10573. When the slacker time came, did they still refuse to do that work?
No; but as we employed these outside men in the busy season we were bound to look after them in the slack time, or they would not work for us in the busy time.

10574. Then you did not put it out in the slack time in order to punish the men?
No; we were bound to consider the outside hands, who were a convenience to us.

10575. Because they took your work in the busy times, you felt that you were bound to give them some work in the slack times?
Yes.

10576. And in order to do that you had to keep the men in your own factory standing idle?
To a certain extent.

 10577. Have

10577. Have you a rule that the men are not to be allowed to do any work for themselves or their children or their friends?
They are not allowed to bring any garment in to work upon, only to do the society's work.

10578. They are not allowed to bring in work of any kind?
Of any kind.

10579 Is that the usual practice in the trade?
I think in most firms.

10580. Then you say that it is not the case that the usual custom is that a man is allowed to do any little job for himself or an acquaintance?
Any garment he was wearing he would no doubt work upon in our workshop; but he would not be allowed to bring anything in or take anything out.

10581. He would not be allowed to do work for another firm on your premises?
Certainly not.

10582. But not even for himself or his children?
Not for his children, not to bring anything into the stores that would be wanted to be taken out.

10583. Is there any reason for that?
Yes; because workmen have been stopped and found to be not altogether honest.

10584. Can you say whether you pay these men by the piece; I presume it is all piecework?
Yes.

10585. Can you say what your prices are?
Yes.

10586. I think the Committee would be glad to know; there is a regular scale, is there?
There is a regular scale.

10587. It will be sufficient for the purposes of the Committee if you hand it in, if you have it there?
(*The Witness hands in the scale.*)

10588. Is that hung up in the workshop?
Yes.

10589. And is the scale invariably adhered to?
Yes.

10590. Never more nor less paid?
Never less.

10591. In slack time or busy time?
In slack time or busy time.

10592. Have you one of this work which the men declined to take in the busy time?
No, not stock overcoats.

10593. That is not a class of work the men are put upon?
No, that is a class of work we cannot get done inside; but as we find the outside workers are very excellent tailors, we employ them on some other kinds of work as well.

10594. Do you say this is a peculiar class of work, and that your better class of work, which is done inside, is never put out to sweaters?
Certainly not to sweaters; but some of it is given to others besides our own men.

10595. Marks

10595. Marks and Wilkie?
Yes, a small portion.

10596. What proportion of your better class of work would it be; a half?
No, certainly not.

10597. Would it be a twentieth?
It might be a twentieth.

10598. Do the men enter into any contract with you?
No.

10599. Then they are free to come and go as they like?
Certainly; and if in the slack time the men have not got sufficient work, we are quite willing to let them go home and work for themselves.

10600. All you undertake to do is to provide them with a place to work in?
That is all.

10601. Does it often happen that a man sits there a whole week, and is not paid a farthing?
No, certainly not.

10602. You have never known such a case?
No, never.

10603. Can you say at all what is the minimum amount that a man is able to earn a week in your factory?
I have not got that.

10604. Is the amount of work that is being done outside increasing?
No, I think it is about as usual.

10605. Mr. M'Leod, in his evidence at No. 8202, is asked by Lord Derby, he previously having stated that the quantity of work put out was increasing, "Is that in consequence of the business having increased, and there not being room, or not hands enough, available on the premises?" and his answer is, "I worked there some years ago, but for some few years I have not worked there. At the time that I speak of the men were supposed to be kept employed, those men that worked indoors; if there was an overplus it was to be given to the outside people; but at the present time the great grievance is that the sweater gets the work to the detriment of the man sitting in the shop, because, of course, when he does not work he has no pay." Do you say that that is not increasing?
Since Mr. M'Leod worked in the workshop, which is, perhaps, from six to eight years ago, the men refused in the busy time to make servants' clothes, and therefore these outside men were taken on specially to do that class of work which the men refused to do, and there was great difficulty in getting it done; in fact, out of the whole workshop of about say 100 men, we only had about five or six men that would do that class of work at all.

10606. Is that a lower paid class of work?
It is.

10607. And there was sufficient to keep them occupied on the higher class of work, and therefore they declined to take the lower class?
In the busy season it was so.

10608. Because they could earn higher wages on a better class of work?
Yes.

10609. Are the coats you speak of part of that lower class of work?
Yes; the servants' clothes.

10610. And what is the higher class of work that they continued to work on?
All gentlemen's work.

10611. Bespoke work?
Yes, bespoke work.

10612. Lord *Thring.*] With regard to your own men being kept out of work, you said they were never kept out of work for a week; what is about the average time that they will sit in your workshop without any work?
In the very slack periods they might lose half a week.

10613. Then why do they come to your workshop?
Because they cannot do better elsewhere.

10614. Why could not they sit at home and work there, and you send for them when you wanted them?
They could if they wished.

10615. But that is not the practice?
That is not the practice.

10616. Therefore, as a matter of fact, the men do waste three or four days a week, in the very slack time, in your workshop?
Just so.

10617. Lord *Sandhurst.*] Can you give us any idea of the wages that a man can earn, the maximum and the minimum, per week?
We have been through it in our own workshop, and find it averages, taking all the men into consideration, about 30 *s.* a week, and that the men in the busy times earns 3 *l.* and upwards; slow men would earn possibly only about 45 *s.*

10618. Then a man in the very slack time, and losing half a week, could not earn less than 15 *s.*?
A second-rate man would not earn more than half of what he earns in the busy time.

10619. Lord *Clinton.*] Your men do not leave you, I understand, in consequence of this system of occasionally putting out work?
Not to my knowledge.

10620. You must know whether they leave you?
Journeymen tailors frequently go and come; we are constantly changing our men. They might go to any other best West end tailor and work for so many months, and perhaps they travel about from place to place; and, again, in the slack time they might go down to the seaside towns, knowing that there is more work there.

10621. But you do not know that they leave you in consequence of your system of occasionally putting out work?
Certainly not; I believe the men are quite satisfied. We employ them as fully as any other of the good firms.

10622. Do you employ other firms besides Marks and Wilkie?
Yes, 20 firms outside.

10623. Have you given any figure of the amount of wages you pay outside your own premises?
I can do so (*handing in a statement*).

10624. Are the prices you give to workmen outside the same as you give to those inside?
The same as is paid for similar work inside the society's own workshops.

10625. And do you know whether all that work is done by the 20 firms?
We do; and we have examined all their workshops to know that they are perfectly sanitary.

10626. As a rule, is it done in factories in these cases?
No; in the tailoring trade there are many of the very best tailors that will not come into a workshop to work; they prefer to work at home, and sometimes have a little assistance from the wife in plain sewing.

10627. Therefore those firms that you employ outside put out their work?
No; they work themselves in the neighbourhood of the stores as a rule.

10628. But

10628. But you spoke of firms?
The reason I mentioned firms is because they may employ only a single hand themselves, or from that up to three or four hands; some keep assistants

10629. Those three or four hands, where do they work, in private houses?
They work in private houses. Some have regular workshops; others might work in a very respectable sitting room.

10630. But you say you know the private houses in which that work is done?
They have all been examined by myself, the manager of the workshop, and the chief cutter.

10631. And you know the sanitary condition of those rooms?
Yes.

10632. And is it all good?
Fairly good.

10633. Lord *Sandhurst.*] Having examined all these shops of these firms, you are perfectly confident there is no such thing as sweating?
Certainly.

10634. Lord *Monkswell.*] Supposing a man went home in the slack time, would you count it at all against him as regards giving him work in the full time?
Not at all.

10635. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] How is the work in the slack time distributed in the factory; in turn to the men that are there?
That is left to the greatest extent to the manager in the workshop. He has to see that all the men are fairly dealt with as regards work; but as a rule the cutters, who are held responsible for their work, prefer the best men to do it, the most reliable men; and therefore no doubt they do get a greater preference shown them as compared with the inferior hands; but those inferior hands are not bound to stop if they know there is no work; if they can do better they have a right to go elsewhere.

10636. *Chairman.*] You have explained to the Committee the reason why you have been obliged to give out this cheap work; but I want to know whether you have any reason for giving out the better class of work, which I understand you sometimes do?
The reason is that in the busy time we cannot get sufficient hands. The tailoring trade is quite a season trade, and for about two months there comes three times the amount of work that you can do.

10637. Do you never put out the better class of work in slack times?
If it is wanted in a hurry we may do so.

10638. Supposing any of your men were idle, would you give out the better class of work rather than give it to the idle men?
It depends on the class of work; if the man outside was a very efficient workman and most suited to do that work, it would be given to him.

10639. But other things being equal, what would you do?
We should give the preference to the inside workman.

10640. I do not know whether you said, in reply to Lord Sandhurst, what was the minimum wages you have known a man receive in your factory on a Saturday, the minimum pay taken on a Saturday?
That might have been very low, because the workman might have only worked for a single day. Of course it is impossible to get at that now; and not only that, men are frequently away from their workshops either for their own convenience in the slack time, or it may be that they are not steady.

10641. Do you recollect the case of Walsh, a coat maker, who received only 8 *s.* on a Saturday?
No.

10642. Do you recollect the case of Flynn, a trouser maker, who received about 6 *s.* or 8 *s.* on a Saturday, and left because he could not afford to stay; he earned so little?
No.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

The Honourable ROBERT WELLESLEY GROSVENOR, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

10643. *Chairman.*] Are you the Chairman of the Army and Navy Co-operative Society?
I am.

10644. Have you heard the evidence which has been given by the last witness?
Most of it; I was not present when he came first under examination, but I think I have heard nearly all of it?

10645. Do you corroborate what you have heard, so far as it falls within your personal knowledge?
Yes.

10646. Do you know anything of the man who has been mentioned to the Committee, Mr. Marks?
Yes.

10647. Do you know the premises in which he carries on his business?
Yes.

10648. You have personally inspected them?
I have personally visited them.

10649. And you have every reason to be satisfied with the work he does and the premises in which he carries it on?
I found it a very excellent workshop.

10650. And you believe that the same applies to Wilkie, and the other hands that are employed by the society?
I understand so from the managing director, who has inspected Wilkie's premises. As regards the others, they are not firms in the true sense of the word, or perhaps I should say, certainly not more than one or two of them; there are no more than three or four hands employed; the remainder are people working in their own homes, who may be assisted by a relative, perhaps, but who work in their own homes in preference to coming to our workshop.

10651. Do you make any inquiry into the sanitary condition of the places in which the work is carried on?
The direction of the Board is that these places shall be visited from time to time, and I believe they have all been visited, not only by the manager of the department, whom you have just had before you, but also by the managing directors.

10652. And do you make any inquiry into the condition of the people who are employed upon those premises?
Do you mean the sanitary condition?

10653. No; I meant the pecuniary condition, the wages they received and the hours during which they worked, and the time allowed them for meals?

We

We know nothing about the hours during which they work; they are piece-workers, and therefore work in their own homes; they work when they please and as long as they please. All I know is that they receive fair prices for the garments which they produce.

10654. Is it with the consent of the Board that this work is put out?
Certainly.

10655. And do you limit it to any class of work?
No.

10656. The managing director has power to put out any work which he thinks proper?
Yes, I should say so; in fact the manager of the department would have a certain latitude to carry on the business of his department in the manner most convenient and most for the interest of his society.

10657. Do you then look upon your factory as merely a convenient place to which people can come and do work for the Army and Navy Stores?
We desire to have our work done there; that is our wish.

10658. Then do you discourage the putting out of your work by your manager?
We do not encourage it.

10659. Have you informed him that it is your desire that as much work should be done on the premises as possible?
I think he knows that. I cannot say that I am aware that the Board have given him any personal directions upon the subject.

10660. But you believe he knows that that is the wish of the Board?
Certainly; I should say so.

10661. You heard the statement made by the last witness that a certain class of work was put out because in busy times the workers inside declined to undertake it, and he could not get it done outside in the busy time unless he also gave some work out in the slack time; do you believe that that is carried further than it need be?
I have no reason for thinking so.

10662. It has been alleged that the managing director or directors frequently take the customers of the Army and Navy Stores into the factory, and assure them that all the work is made in the factory, and none put out; do you know whether that is the case or not?
I cannot say as regards the managing directors, but certainly I think I may answer as regards the other members of the Board that no such statement has been made; but I may inform your Lordships that one of the managing directors is here, and would be glad to answer that question if your Lordship wishes.

10663. I think we will take it from you as far as it is within your knowledge?
I never heard of it.

10664. Is there any announcement on any of the circulars of the society, asserting that all work is done upon the premises?
Not that I am aware of.

10665. Lord *Thring*.] Your society is a co-operative one?
Yes.

10666. Do you pay a dividend also?
Certainly.

10667. And, of course, you wish to make the most you can of your business, like any other commercial society?
Not quite so. Our object is to sell to customers as cheaply as possible.

10668. We have been told that men sit in your shops in the slack season, some for two days, some for three days, without work; are you aware of that fact?
I have no knowledge of that detail.

10669. If you did know it would you approve of it?
Yes, I should, because I imagine the men are there to get such work as they can, not being able to get better work elsewhere.

10670. True; but what would be the objection to their going home, and your sending for them when you had the work?
I see no special objection, but I imagine it is not the custom of the trade.

10671. What would be the objection to allowing these men during these three days to bring in work of their own if they had it, for their children, or for themselves?
Because if you allow men to bring things in you have very little control upon what they take out.

10672. You are afraid it would lead to dishonesty, in other words?
Exactly so.

10673. Therefore you approve of the rule as it stands?
Yes; I do not disapprove of it.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. ABRAM MARKS, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

10674. *Chairman.*] Are you the Mr. Marks who has been alluded to in the evidence given by Mr. M'Leod?
Yes.

10675. Do you do work for the Army and Navy Co-operative Society?
Yes.

10676. What class of work is it?
Mostly it is the livery trade, and such as white clothing, drills and flannels, and all such things.

10677. Is that a less highly paid class of work?
Yes.

10678. And what time of year do you do your chief business with the Army and Navy Stores?
In the season.

10679. Is there a very great difference in the amount of work that you have during the season, and the work that you have out of the season?
There is.

10680. Have you got any premises in the nature of a factory?
Yes.

10681. Do you work for anybody besides the Army and Navy Stores?
The Civil Service Supply Association.

10682. If you got work only during the busy season, and none during the slack season, could you carry on the business?
No; I do not do the same amount in the slack season as in the busy season.

10683. But supposing you had no custom at all from the Army and Navy Stores during the slack season, could you continue to carry on your business?
No.

10684. Do

10684. Do you believe that anybody in your trade could carry on the business under those conditions?
No.

10685. Therefore, if you take work from the Army and Navy Stores during the busy season, do you have any understanding with them that they shall give you some work in the slack season?
Some support in the slack season; else how could I keep it up.

10686. If they declined to do that, would you throw up your business with them?
Yes, I would.

10687. And do you think they would get anybody else in the trade to take it?
Not under those conditions.

10688. Therefore if they have some work which they must put out in the busy season, they must also put out some work in the slack season, in order to get their work done in the busy season?
Yes; but at the same time with regard to a great portion of the work that I take in the busy season, as far as the livery trade goes, in the slack season a certain amount of it goes to the indoor hands; they give the indoor hands the privilege.

10689. Do you ever take any of the better class of work in; bespoke work, gentlemen's suits?
In the season when they are pushed, when they cannot get sufficient men indoors, I do a little of it.

10690. Do you ever take any of this better class work out of the season in the slack times?
Sometimes. That is only on certain occasions, when there is an order wanted by a special time.

10691. Do you know the scale of prices which are paid by the stores to their workers indoors?
I do.

10692. How do they compare with the prices which you pay to your people?
They do not do the class of work that I do; but for the class of work that I do they pay me the same price as they do their indoor hands.

10693. You said you do the better class of work sometimes?
They pay me the same price as their indoor hands for that.

10694. Lord *Sandhurst.*] Do you employ a middle-man?
Pardon me, what do you mean by a "middle-man"?

10695. Do you give out work to a man to get done for you?
No; all my work is done on the premises. I have got a plan of the premises which I occupy. I do not occupy a place which is in an unsanitary condition, or else I should not have brought a plan of it. And also I have a statement of the wages that my men draw from me per week.

10696. Lord *Monkswell.*] Does the factory inspector ever come to your premises?
Very seldom.

10697. He has come?
Yes, they have been; but, as far as the inspector coming down to my place goes, I do not employ any women; all the women I employ on my premises are two besides my daughter.

10698. And how long do you keep your premises open?
It all depends according to the season. That is the advantage a large firm has got, that they employ men out of doors.

10699. What is the longest time you keep your men at work?
My men work from 12 to 14 hours; that is only at times.

10700. Never more than 14 hours?
No.

10701. *Chairman.*] Do you live at No. 7, Rose-street, West-end?
I do not live there; I occupy my workshops there.

10702. You are the Mr. Marks, then, who is referred to by Mr. Lewis Lyons at No. 3583?
Yes.

10703. Do you employ about 30 or 40 hands?
No, I never employed to the amount of 30.

10704. And you told me in reply to some questions just now that you paid them the same prices that the Civil Service pay?
No; I say I get the same price from the Civil Service.

10705. What do you pay them, one-half of what you get?
No, more; I pay them two-thirds; on some jobs I pay them more; but, in addition to that, you will find that I have other expenses. They are paid for a certain part.

10706. You have, of course, to find the premises?
I have to find the premises and to find machining and gas.

10707. So do the stores, do they not?
But then the stores only pay me the prices that they do the indoor hands. They find all that for them; but I have to find all that myself.

10708. Therefore you must pay less, in order to be able to make a profit?
I work as well as any men I employ; I take a job as well as anyone.

10709. Where is the entrance to your premises?
Through a large gateway.

10710. Not through a stable?
No.

10711. Not through a shed?
No, a respectable entrance fit for any place.

10712. On which floor is the workshop?
On the top floor.

10713. And have you got a water-closet on the premises?
Down below.

10714. More than one?
There is one in the gateway, and there is one in Rose-street.

10715. And is that used by all your workpeople?
No; the one in the gateway is used by the men, but the one in the street is used by the women.

10716. You do not occupy the whole house?
No.

10717. What do the rest of the people in the house do; do they use the same w.c.?
No.

10718. Have they got one of their own?
They have got a w.c. above.

10719. Upstairs?
Yes.

10720. What hours do your workpeople work?

I mentioned

I mentioned that; from 12 to 14 hours; but all my workpeople are paid by piecework, I do not employ them by the day, nor by the hour.

10721. Do you say that you never work them from 17 to 18 hours?
No.

10722. Never?
It might occur once now and then, but that is very seldom. It might occur in the case of mourning, or anything like that.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. LEWIS LYONS, having been re-called; is further Examined, as follows:

10723. *Chairman.*] In answer to Question 8785, Mr. Mark Moses said: "I allude to Lewis Lyons, a witness who has appeared before your Lordships' Committee. He occupied an official position in this co-operative business, the "Working Tailors' Association, Limited," and displayed his unselfish devotion to the interests of his comrades by absconding with the cash balance. I make this statement, with his full permission, on the authority of a gentleman of unimpeachable honour and position, namely, Mr. Schloss himself * * * * I have a letter from Mr. Schloss himself if you would like to see it (*producing a letter*). (Lord *Sandhurst.*) Have you the authority of Mr. Schloss for producing it? (*A.*) I have (*handing the letter to the Chairman*). (Lord *Thring.*) Did Mr. Schloss authorise you to produce this letter in evidence? (*A.*) I had a letter accompanying this, saying that I could produce this letter for any purpose I chose. (*Chairman.*) Mr. Lyons has since paid back the greater part of it, if not all, has he not? (*A.*) He has not paid his part back to Mr. Schloss." I understand that you wish to give some evidence to the Committee upon that allegation?

I wish to give some evidence with respect to that allegation; also with regard to the statements that he made respecting my evidence on the sweating system, because he said that he would contradict the statements of every witness, and especially mine. But with regard to the subject just alluded to, there has been some misunderstanding. I held an official position as secretary for 12 months without pay; and in consequence of that misunderstanding it requires a great deal of explanation, and unless I give the whole of that explanation, your Lordships will not be able to understand what is meant by the statement about my having absconded with money. I admit that I withheld the money for certain reasons which they would never allow me to explain. The original sum was 2 *l.* 17 *s.* 11 *d.*, out of which 1 *l.* 14 *s.* has been paid. The whole amount would have been paid before now had I received a letter in reply to mine which I sent to Mr. Nash to whom I had paid the money, but he refused to reply to my letter respecting that letter which Mr. Schloss had sent to somebody about me, and therefore I stopped payment till he gave some information respecting the nature of the letter which Mr. Schloss had sent to the sweaters. Of course, your Lordships will understand that this statement was one of several statements made by Mr. Schloss, and was made with the motive of personally attacking me in order that the members of the society may lose confidence in me respecting this allegation; but I will show to your Lordships that, in spite of that personal attack, and I shall show you that there has been a motive for it, I never had more of the trust and confidence of the working classes, both Jewish and English, than at the present time.

10724. I think we must confine ourselves to the rebutting of this charge?
Will you allow me to explain the whole of this besides rebutting the evidence he gave respecting the trade?

10725. Will you go on with your statement about the cash, and I will look through the evidence given against you and let you know?
I was the founder of this Working Tailors' Association, but it was not called

the Working Tailors' Association at first; it was called, I think, the Working Men's Clothing Co-operative Society. The first meeting I called was on the 21st of July 1884, and I invited a number of persons who I thought would take an interest in that movement, also a number of working men who I thought would also take an interest in that movement. Mr. Schloss and Miss Simcox, Mr. Benjamin Jones, and several other persons, attended that meeting and several other meetings, and we discussed the question of forming a co-operative society. I have got the minutes of that first meeting here, by which your Lordships will see that Mr. Schloss said that he would lend a sum of 10 *l.* towards the formation of this society, and if it succeeded he would lend some more, but should it fail he would not require his first 10 *l.* back. After our first and second meeting I worked every day in the week for about 12 months, I think, nearly 12 months (that could be borne out by the men who belonged to that society), without a single farthing of pay. I got that society registered, and I attended every Saturday night to receive subscriptions, besides working every day and running about and so forth. During that time that I was secretary (and this is four years ago) it came to the knowledge of these sweaters that I had been trying to form a co-operative society, which would mean the abolition of the sweaters, and I was constantly discharged from employment; I could not get any employment at all. Whenever I got employment they went round to the sweaters and told them that they must discharge me, because I was trying to abolish the sweaters; and I may assure your Lordships that during the 12 months, all the time that I was secretary, which can be borne out by the men or working tailors, at that time I was practically walking about starving, because I received no pay from the association; neither did I require it, because I thought that I would get work from time to time, but I found it impossible. At last a man came to me and said, "Do you want a job?" he knew I was out of work. I said, "Yes." He said, "I can give you a job in the country," and he mentioned the price. I took the job, but when I got there they only gave me a half of what was mentioned in London. For 12 weeks previous to going to the country I was out of work, and did not earn a single farthing; but still I attended every Saturday night to receive subscriptions from the working tailors at the rate of 6 *d.* per week; it was a 1 *l.* share, and the rules said 6 *d.* a week would be quite sufficient. Previous to the 12 weeks, I handed over all the money to the treasurer; sometimes 5 *l.*, sometimes 3 *l.*, sometimes 2 *l.*; and during the 12 weeks I was out of work, 2 *l.* 17 *s.* 11 *d.* was accumulated by me in sums of 2 *s.*, 3 *s.*, and 1 *s.*; I did not think it worth while going to the treasurer with small sums, but kept them till a large sum accumulated, and then I would take the whole. During that time that I was out of work, and I had this 3 *s.* or 4 *s.* in my pocket from week to week, I admit that I spent this money on food, hoping that I would get work next week and pay it back; but it so happened that the money accumulated to 2 *l.* 17 *s.* 11 *d.*, but I spent it at intervals in buying food, otherwise I should be dead by now. As soon as I arrived in the country, on the second day, I sent a letter to Mr. Schloss, or to Mr. Nash, who took my place afterwards, saying I had got work, giving my address, and stating that I had been deceived by the man who sent me over there, and that I would in a fortnight's time pay back the money every week to the treasurer, because I was still secretary then. I was not asked to give up the money, because they knew that I kept the money till I had 4 *l.* or 5 *l.* at a time to give to the treasurer. I have got the receipt here, which I can show you, signed by the treasurer, of the monies I handed to him from time to time. At the time when I got that situation, I was deceived as to the wages I would get, and I worked for four or five weeks, and hardly earned enough to keep myself, and consequently I could not send any money to pay this back. I told them that, that I had not had sufficient, and they were agreed that that money which I had spent in buying food, in consequence of the sweaters not giving me any work (and, of course, they did not pay me for a single hour's work, and I worked 12 months without pay), should be a debt. I told them that I did not wish to take it, but that I simply withheld it, and they put it down as a debt; and when I came back

back to London I paid 1 *l.* 14 *s.* back; but in consequence of my taking that money I have been accused of absconding, or some other names which they wished to apply to me, which I did not like. The committee agreed that it should be paid off as a debt, as they acknowledged the work which I did all that time for nothing; and Mr. Schloss, who simply lent money to the association, seems now to attack me with that particular item which is now mentioned; and wherever I go to a meeting, or speak to a meeting, although the working men who were members of that society entirely ignore the conduct of Mr. Schloss and the others about it, for they were on the committee and decided that it should be a debt, these persons are continually coming up with this letter, though I have paid off 1 *l.* 14 *s.*, and the reason why I cannot pay the other money off is because I cannot get any work from the sweaters. I have been out of work three weeks. The last time I was here I was employed by a man in Plummer's-row, but he has gone to Newcastle now, and I cannot work with him any longer.

10726. Are you prepared to pay this money back?

If I get the work. I am willing to go to work to-day, but they will not give me work. In another week I shall have to walk about the streets, because I have lodgings to pay for and food, and they will not give me work because I am exposing these evils. When a man had been working 12 months for a society without pay, and working very hard for them, and did not receive a single penny, and got discharged from time to time, what could a man do under those circumstances, and a working man? I was not a man with money; I could not keep it on; and they are continually charging me with the charge mentioned in this letter of Mr. Schloss, which I do not think is at all a crime. In the first place there was only 2 *l.* 17 *s.* 11 *d.* due altogether, and even if I were to charge them a shilling a week for doing their business, the amount of pay would be more than that; but I have paid 1 *l.* 14 *s.* I cannot get any work, but if your Lordships will give me work, I will go and do it.

10727. Briefly, it comes to this: you deny that you took away the money; you claim that there was a counter debt, and you are prepared to pay back the balance of the sum when you are in a position to do so?

£. 1 3 *s.* I have the receipts of the man that I paid, and who put it down as a debt. This is what is written in this book (*showing a book to the Chairman*): "Account of sums received from Mr. Lewis Lyons, in discharge of the debt of 2 *l.* 17 *s.* 11 *d.* owing by him to the Working Tailors' Association, Limited."

10728. You admit that it is a debt, and you say that there is a contra account?

Yes. They do this in order that they may ruin me, because they think that if they make this statement persons will not have any confidence in me; but everybody who knows me, and that I was born in London, from a child knows the character of me and the character of my family also. But I ask your Lordships under the circumstances, when a man has worked 12 months for a society of workmen, and is being prevented from getting employment by the sweaters, when he is depending upon them for work, where else can he go to? I wonder how I kept it up as long as I have, but I thought there was some hope of the condition of the workers being ameliorated.

10729. I must consult the Committee on the other points which are touched upon in the evidence. I have glanced through the evidence of Mr. Moses, and I find that there are four or five points only on which he contradicted you especially. One was with regard to lifting the iron so many times in the hour; another was as to the meeting which was alleged to have been interrupted by you?

I did not notice that.

10730. I do not think there is any importance in that. Then the 40 garments and the prices you said were paid for the garments, and the life and work of the *employés* in Mr. Moses' workshops. Those were the points; were there any other points?

Yes, a good many more. I have got the "Daily News" report.

10731. Will you hand me in a copy of the "Daily News" that you refer to?
Yes (*handing in the same*). And also I should like to refer to the evidence of Sheppard, of the firm of Nicoll's.

After a short adjournment,—

10732. *Chairman.*] The Committee have considered the proposals you have put before them, to offer further evidence upon Mr. Moses' evidence; but we think that we are not justified in hearing anything more than the rebutting evidence upon any personal charges that may be brought against witnesses who have already given evidence. I understand that you adhere to all the evidence that you have given before; we have it upon the notes, and do not think it advisable to go a second time into the evidence of a witness which has been given upon the main principles of the sweating system; and, therefore, we cannot hear any general remarks in reference to Mr. Moses, unless there is any special charge that is brought against your character personally?
That was the only one I mentioned. There was also the question as to lifting the iron.

10733. You adhere to the evidence which you gave originally on that point?
Yes. I should like to inform your Lordships that when we heard Mr. Moses' evidence, the London Tailors' Machinists' Society issued about 2,000 circulars, asking the working men to sign a paper as to whether the statements of Mark Moses were true; and within two days I received 515 answers, stating that they considered them to be false; and there are more to come (*handing in the circulars*).

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. JACOB SMITH, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

10734. *Chairman.* You are a tailor, are you not?
Yes.

10735. Do you live in Prescott-street?
Yes.

10736. Are you the Mr. Smith alluded to by Mr. Lyons in his evidence at No. 3584?
Yes.

10737. Do you work for Messrs. Nicoll?
I have been working for Messrs. Nicoll for many years.

10738. Is it a fact that last year you paid a fine of 25 *l.* for neglecting the factory law?
In 1882, in November.

10739. Have you anything that you wish to say to the Committee with respect to the evidence given by Mr. Lyons?
By all means. I work on the very best gentlemen's trade, and I get very good prices, and I pay very good prices, and I have people who have been working with me this last 15 and 18 years, male and female, and I always satisfy them, and they were always pleased with my wages. In 1882, when I had to pay the fine, it was only because I got a female living as far as Mile End, and instead of coming in according to the rules at 8 o clock, the females come in at a quarter to 0, and of course according to the rules they have an hour to dinner and half an hour to tea, and they leave off at 8 o'clock; so they have no objection to work another quarter of an hour later. Of course on Thursday night, according to law, I have a sheet sent in; I got a book at Waterlow's——

10740. Book No. 40, do you mean.
Yes, and I send in a sheet. They are allowed to work on Thursday night (I being

(I being of the Jewish persuasion, and leaving off on Friday when the sun sets) two hours extra. So some of the females coming at a quarter to 9 worked till a quarter past 10. The inspector came up and found them working overtime. Then the very same week I married a daughter, and of course I was rather upset a little with the wedding affair, and being found working a quarter of an hour later I was fined for the three females 22 *l.* 16 *s.* That was in 1882.

10741. What is your arrangement with Messrs. Nicoll with regard to your premises; do they belong to you or to Messrs. Nicoll?
To me.

10742. They do not belong to Messrs. Nicoll?
I am not doing anything for Messrs. Nicoll; I am doing the very best first-class trade.

10743. Do you take work for anybody besides Messrs. Nicoll?
I do not do anything for Messrs. Nicoll; I do for the Civil Service Stores. I have done for many years, and I was taken away from Messrs. Nicoll.

10744. How many hands do you employ?
Five machines and about eight females, and about four men.

10745. What water-closet accommodation is there?
Two.

10746. How many rooms are there in your house?
Eleven rooms.

10747. And two water-closets for the 11 rooms?
Yes. I have the inspectors come in occasionally to look after the place, and they are well satisfied.

10748. What is the average wage that the men earn?
They earn from 7 *s.* to 8 *s.* a day.

10749. You say that it is not a fact that the average wages of your men would be 18 *s.* a week?
In two and a-half days they would get that.

10750. Do they work every day in the week?
If they would work every day in the week, they would earn a great deal more, of course; but sometimes, when they have made a day, they earn good wages.

10751. How many days a week on the average do they work?
I dare say about four and a half days you can reckon it the whole year round.

10752. At at an average of 7 *s.* a day?
And upwards.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. HERMANN WILKIE, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

10753. *Chairman.*] Do you live in High-street, Borough?
Yes.

10754. And do you take work for the Army and Navy Co-operative Stores?
Yes.

10755. About what do you receive a week in the worst time of the trade?
About 2 *l.* 15 *s.*; 2 *l.* 10 *s.* or 2 *l.* 15 *s.*

10756. In the worst time?
In the worst time.

10757. How much in the best time of the trade?
In the best time of the year I have earned up to 20 *l.*

10758. And what class of work is it you do for the stores?
Just servants' work, white flannel and white drill work; and the work must be kept very clean, so the journeymen do not care much for that class of work to do, flannel and drill.

10759. Do you get it throughout the year from the stores?
I have been there six years.

10760. And all the year do you get work from the stores?
Yes.

10761. In the busy and slack times?
Yes.

10762 Do you ever get the higher class; the bespoke work?
Yes; not many times.

10763. When do you get that; in the busy time or in the slack time?
In the busy time, when they are pushed; in the slack time we very seldom see any of the best class of work.

10764. Do you receive from the stores the same price as they pay to their men who work in-doors?
I receive for first-class trousers, 6 *s.* 3 *d.*; on tweed trousers, 5 *s.* 3 *d.*; then the machine work, the servants' work, and the white flannel and the drill, are practically all machine work. The best work is all hand work.

10765. Do you know at all what the prices paid to the indoor workers are in the stores?
The best work I have seen the prices of.

10766. And are the same prices paid to you for that?
I am getting paid the same prices.

10767. Now, as to the cheaper work?
The flannels are made 4 *s.*, and servants' tweed 3 *s.* 6 *d.*

10768. Is that the same price as what the stores pay to their indoor workers?
I do not know.

10769. What proportion of that do you pay to your people; do you pay half?
No; the work goes all to four hands.

10770. And do you pay them by the piece?
Yes.

10771. And when you have paid the four hands, does the total amount that you pay to those four come to one-half of what the stores pay to you?
More than that a great deal.

10772. Two-thirds?
Yes.

10773. More than two-thirds?
About two-thirds; I could not say exactly, because my labour is attached to that.

10774. You think you pay about two-thirds, and get one-third for yourself?
About that. I have to work very hard myself, from early in the morning till late at night, and superintend in the workshop.

10775. Now, supposing you did not get any work from the stores during the slack time, could you still continue to do their work during the busy time?
No, I could not.

10776. If the stores declined to give you any work in the slack time, and offered

offered you work in the busy time only, would you take work from them in the busy time?
No, I would not; I could not do so.

10777. Do you require that they should give you the same amount in the slack time as in the busy time?
No.

10778. Half as much?
Not half as much; about a quarter comes in the slack times.

10779. And unless you had a quarter as much in the slack times as you get in the busy times, you could not continue to work for the stores at all?
No.

10780. Earl of *Limerick.*] Do you make flannel jackets for the stores?
No; only trousers.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. W. BRAMWELL BOOTH, is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

10781. *Chairman.*] WHAT is your position in the Salvation Army?
I am the Chief of the Staff to my father, General Booth.

10782. On the 4th of May Mr. Adamson, who gave evidence before the Committee, said that the Salvation Army "offered to make match-boxes for large firms at 2½ *d.* when the people had previously been getting 2¾ *d.*;" and he said he meant "the organised Salvation Army from head-quarters. None of the members of the Salvation Army are allowed to do work without the authority and permission of the 'General.' When the Salvation Army was started at the Congress Hall, as they call it, at Clapton, then they competed with the poor women and their daughters at 2¼ *d.*, when they had previously been getting 2¾ *d.*" And on the 15th of May Mr. Adamson said, "In giving evidence on Thursday, the 3rd of May, upon competition as affecting prices, and apart altogether from my subsequent evidence on sweating, I adduced incidentally the question of matchbox making and laundry work in connection with the Salvation Army. * * * The Salvation Army, in a letter to 'The Times' on Saturday last, the 12th, gave an explicit denial to this general report which I and others had for years understood to be perfectly true, and which, but for that express correction, I would still have continued fully to believe." Have you anything to say upon that?
The statement that the Salvation Army has ever made or proposed to make or offered to make at the price mentioned by Mr. Adamson, or at any other price, matches or match-boxes, is absolutely without foundation.

10783. You mean to say that you have never made match-boxes?
Never. Mr. Adamson has been grossly misinformed, and it is unfortunate that he did not take the ordinary precaution of inquiring from some responsible person in connection with us whether there was any foundation for his statements. They are absolutely untrue. We were glad to see that upon the later date Mr. Adamson did modify, to a very large extent, his statements, and withdrew, I think, some of them. I should not have troubled the Committee, by attending here, but that I thought it desirable, in the interests of our people, all over the world, to state, in the most emphatic manner possible, that the whole story is a fabrication. The same may be said with regard to the suggestion that the Salvation Army does, or has done, or proposes to do, laundry work; there is no truth whatever in the statement. The Congress Hall to which Mr. Adamson referred, our building at Clapton in the North of London, is used, and has been used since we acquired it in 1882, entirely for the training of men and women to spend their lives in the work of the army as leaders

and officers; it has never been put to any such purpose as Mr. Adamson suggested, or anything akin to it. Indeed, the whole spirit of the work of the army and of the workers of the army is opposed to anything of the kind. Our whole aim and purpose and business is to improve and raise up, socially as well as religiously, the poorest of the people; and in support of that statement, I may say that at this very time we have engaged in London 40 persons who live in the very worst slums of the East and South who carry on one special branch of our work, known as slum work, and who give their whole time to the nursing of the sick of the very poorest, and helping the mothers with their children, and so on, and are brought into contact with a great number of these very poor and unfortunate people who suffer from the system into which your Lordships' Committee is inquiring. This is only one department of our work in London; still it is, I think, an unanswerable proof of the fact that we are most desirous to help these people rather than to do anything to hinder or injure them.

10784. And do the members of your army do any work?
Yes; the members of our army support themselves in the ordinary way all over the kingdom.

10785. In different trades?
Yes; in various trades.

10786. Of their own chosing?
Of their own chosing, entirely.

10787. And not at all under your direction?
Not at all. There are (and Mr. Adamson has confused his facts) between some 6,000 and 7,000 persons who are employed in the army as officers, or missionaries or ministers as they would be called by other religious societies, and these are naturally of course under specific obligations to the authorities of the organisation; they are supported out of its funds; but the great mass of the people who are connected with the Salvation Army, both in this country and others, are just ordinary working people who support themselves at their various trades.

10788. Earl of *Derby*.] I understand from you that the body which you call the army has nothing to do collectively with any such business as that about which you have been asked; but I suppose you do not deny that persons connected with the so-called army may have been individually concerned in such transactions?
I am not aware that any persons who are connected with us have been in any shape or form associated with this sweating system. I have had opportunities since the statement of Mr. Adamson of making some rather careful inquiries, at any rate in London, and I have failed to discover that any persons at all connected with us have anything to do with the system. I think I have turned up one or two individual cases of people in connection with these slum visitors, who do support themselves, or partially support themselves, by making flowers, brushes, and that kind of thing at a very low rate; but I have not found any matchbox makers that I could really find were connected with us in any shape or form.

10789. And do you say that if any of your people had been connected with the sweating system you think you must have known it?
I think so, at any rate in London; and it is to London especially that I have confined my inquiries in the matter.

10790. At any rate you have not heard of anything of the kind, and you do not believe it exists, as I understand you?
No; and I should like to say there, with the permission of the Committee (I do not know whether I should be quite in order in doing so), that Mr. Adamson, I think, stated in a letter to the "Times" newspaper that he had heard these statements made upon certain authority, which he called a good authority; but I am bound to say that we have never heard them; we have never

never heard them at any rate in any such form as Mr. Adamson presented them; and I have the greatest difficulty in believing that with our intimacy with the people, and knowledge of what is going on, we should not have heard what he heard. I should just like to add, if you please, that I hope it will not be understood that my appearing at this time, and attending at this time, before the Committee, indicates that I or we have any sympathy with persons who are representing to the Committee that the sweating system is not so frightful and abominable a system as it undoubtedly is. Your Lordships will remember that I made application to make this contradiction immediately after Mr. Adamson gave his evidence, but it was not convenient to the Committee to receive evidence on that side of the matter at that time. So that, although I attend before you at this stage, we do not wish to be at all considered to be associated with witnesses who represent that the sweating system is not, what it undoubtedly is, an abominable and scandalous iniquity.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. GEORGE DALHOUSIE RAMSAY, C.B., is called in; and, having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

10791. *Chairman.*] I THINK you are the Director of Army Clothing?
I am.

10792. Of the Army Clothing Department at Pimlico?
Yes, at Pimlico.

10793. Is it entirely under your control?
Entirely.

10794. Will you explain to the Committee what is the respective position of yourself and the Director of Army Contracts?
The Director of Army Contracts is the officer who makes the contract. I, as Director of Clothing, send forward a demand for the articles which I require; he then makes the contract, and having made the contract it is administered by me, and only referred to him in case of any difficulty.

10795. Are you absolutely responsible for the quality of the stores sent in to Pimlico?
Yes.

10796. Then what would be the course of procedure supposing that you were dissatisfied with the quality of the goods, and thought that they were not according to the sample sent out?
I should then proceed to get an independent inspection.

10797. Who would the independent inspector be?
An inspection by experts outside the Department, which I may say sometimes arises; or if there is a complaint from the army of the inferior quality of supplies, and the inspecting officers of the Clothing Establishment do not agree with the regiment as to the causes of the rejection, it is then my practice to call in an outside opinion to decide between the inspecting officer and the regiment.

10798. We were told by Mr. Nepean that it sometimes happens that articles are sent in to the Stores at Pimlico which vary considerably in quality, and yet which satisfy you as the Director of Army Clothing. We asked Mr. Nepean whether it was not the case, therefore, that some of these articles were of a better class than you paid for and some possibly of a lower class, and we understood him to say that it was not so; that they were all up to the sample, but that some of them exceeded it; will you explain how that arises?
I will explain how we proceed in making a large contract. We will say that we receive perhaps 500,000 pairs of boots a year; you cannot possibly expect

that every pair of boots will be exactly alike; that is a practical impossibility; therefore what we do is this, if there is any article sent in which is not precisely similar to the pattern, although it is equal in money value, and will give as good wear as the pattern, it is our rule to accept it.

10799. Lord *Thring*.] Do you recollect the matter with respect to the 4,000 great coats intended for discharged soldiers, I understand?
Yes.

10800. We were told by Mr. Nepean that some of those coats were above the value of the sample, and that others were up to the sample, but not above it, but that a considerable number possibly were above it?
No coat is accepted that is not up to the samples of material approved, and in accordance with pattern for make.

10801. Yes; but I want to know in those 4,000 coats was there, in your opinion, a considerable difference between the value of the coats that were passed?
No, I should say not.

10802. Then you do not agree with Mr. Nepean that some of them were considerably above the value?
Certainly not. Some may have been above the value, but not considerably above the value, because this is an article you may say of plain clothes; it is not an article of uniform.

10803. Then I asked Mr. Nepean whether it was the fact that these coats were sold at the same price to the discharged soldiers; that is the case, was it not?
All the coats are sold at the same price to the soldiers.

10804. Then I asked him again, "Then, in fact, you sold at the same price better coats to some soldiers and worse coats to others?" and he said, "Yes;" do you agree?
No, I do not agree with that at all. The coats were, taking them all in all, very much the same; Mr. Nepean was thinking, probably, of the plain clothes.

10805. I was talking of this particular set of coats, and I wish you to direct your attention to them, because otherwise we get into a wider field; you do not agree with him that you sold coats of different qualities for the same price?
No, certainly not.

10806. Then we were told that the sample does not govern the material, which is another point which I did not understand; in other words that, as I understand it, there was no sample material?
I have got the particulars of these great coats. The price is fixed at 12*s.* 8*d.*, and there is a sample shown for make and tailoring only; the contractors are required to submit samples of the cloth and linings it is proposed to supply for the price fixed, and those they send in, and the most suitable samples are accepted. Accepted samples are retained for examination of the supplies; and for make, the garment is compared with the sample shown to the contractor.

10807. Then the only difference is that in one case the samples are supplied by the Government, and in the other case the samples are accepted by the Government?
Yes.

10808. But still the sample material is all the same?
The material of the coats must be equal to the sample submitted by the contractor.

10809. Taking those samples with respect to these particular coats, were or were not those sample materials all of the same value, in your opinion?
Yes; I should say about the same value.

10810. There was no material difference?
No material difference, certainly.

10811. Then

10811. Then if the coats were made to sample there could be no material difference in them?
No material difference. I have no doubt that if those coats were sold in a wholesale shop one might fetch a trifle more than another, but certainly there is no such material difference in the value, as I understand has been represented to you.

10812. With respect to the responsibility of passing these coats, who is responsible for the coats delivered by the contractor being up to sample?
The inspector.

10813. Yourself?
No; the inspector is responsible to me.

10814. But who is technically responsible to the Government?
I am responsible to the Government.

10815. Not the Director of Contracts in any form at all?
No, not the Director of Contracts.

10816. Then the inspector looks at them, and you, as a general rule, I presume, take his opinion?
Yes. The inspector is responsible to me; he has the patterns and the specifications to guide him, and he is responsible to me that no supplies are accepted that are not equal to those patterns and specifications, unless he gets a special authority from me to accept.

10817. Do you examine the articles yourself?
I trust the inspector. He is a very highly paid officer and a man of great technical knowledge. He was bred in the cloth trade, and has been a manufacturer himself, and I should be very sorry to put my own opinion up against his.

10818. As to all other articles I suppose it is the same; for instance, for boots, you have a special boot inspector, and so forth?
Yes.

10819. And in every case you trust to that special inspector unless you have reason to doubt his judgment?
Yes.

10820. Then if you have reason to doubt it, what happens?
If I have reason to doubt it, or if there is any complaint from the army of the supplies, then there is an investigation.

10821. Then supposing articles to be passed, and afterwards there is a complaint from the regiment, or the soldiers to whom you supply them, you investigate it afterwards?
Yes.

10822. Lord *Clinton*.] There is a very minute inspection, I suppose?
Very minute; every garment is inspected most minutely.

10823. You spoke just now of 500,000 pairs of boots; is every pair actually inspected, or do you take one specimen out of a lot?
No, every pair is actually inspected, and the viewer, who is a technical man, has his number stamped in every boot that he passes; so that if there is a complaint from any quarter of the globe and the boot is returned to us, we see by the number who the reviewer was who passed that boot, which is the only guarantee we have.

10824. Are there many articles, do you know, rejected during the year in your establishment?
Yes, a great many.

10825. You have no returns of the number, perhaps?
We have very accurate returns in our books to show that.

10826. But not here?
Not here; I did not know that they would be required.

10827. Do you invite tenders from the whole trade, or merely from certain contractors?
In some articles we advertise for tenders openly, but in other articles there is a list kept at the War Office, and every person in the trade knows very well that he can be put upon that list; so that when the time comes to issue tenders, that list is taken, and tenders are sent to all persons upon that list.

10828. You choose, I suppose, those who have served you well, as a rule?
We take the lowest price, provided the firm is good.

10829. Lord *Sandhurst.*] One question arising out of this inspection; it is a fact, is it not, that you inspect every square inch of cloth that goes through your hands?
Every yard of cloth is passed over the roller and examined by experts.

10830. Earl of *Limerick.*] As regards these great coats you have spoken about, they were plain clothes?
Plain clothes.

10831. And as you say that the sample at Pimlico was for make and tailoring, and that, as I understand you, the contractor sends in samples for the material, I presume, that your object was that they should not be all exactly alike?
It was to vary them.

10832. That they should not look as if they were turned out in the nature of a workhouse suit or anything like that?
Yes. I may give you the history of these great coats. We found that invalids coming home from India and the various colonies, when they landed at Portsmouth, bought themselves a great coat, for which they were charged from 30 *s.* to 35 *s.*, and there were great complaints about it, and we were asked to undertake it; we were asked if we would supply these great coats, and sell them to the men; and we undertook to do it; and the result is that I think we have supplied now between 6,000 and 7,000 to the discharged soldiers; and instead of paying what they had to pay before, about 30 *s.*, they are paying now 13 *s.* 6 *d.*

10833. They vary, I presume, not in make, but in colour and appearance?
Only in the shade of colour.

10834. And suits are supplied in the same way, are they not?
Suits in the same way.

10835. And was that because they could be supplied to the soldiers cheaper than they could get them otherwise?
No; that arose when the Government determined to take all the old clothing from the troops, and instead of a discharged soldier going home in a worn-out uniform, he now gets, at the public expense, a suit of private clothes.

10836. The conditions under which they are supplied are identical, I suppose, with those under which the great coats are supplied?
No; they are not actually identical, because, in regard to the great coats we fix the price, and we tell the contractors to send in samples of material according to that price; but in regard to the suits of plain clothes they send in samples and a price as well.

10837. You do not tell them to supply at a certain price?
No.

10838. But they give you a price at which they will supply?
And they send in the sample which they will supply at that price.

10839. Sample suits?
No; a sample of the material which they will supply.

10840. They are, I suppose, made of different colours?
They are made of five or six different colours.

10841. *Chairman.*]

10841. *Chairman.*] We were told by one witness that he had reason to believe that there were commissions paid to some persons, he did not say in Pimlico, by the manufacturers, in order that they might secure the contract; is there any truth in that allegation?

I have not only no proof of it, but I do not believe it, for this simple reason, that no person at Pimlico can influence the contract. The contract is settled on the principle that the lowest tender is accepted, provided the firm is a good one, and that is decided between the Director of Contracts and myself; and if we differ in opinion as to which shall be accepted, it is then referred to superior authority.

10842. Have you anything to do with the insertion of the Factory Clause and seeing to its observance?

I had a great deal to do with the insertion of the Factory Clause, because it was recommended by me; but as regards seeing that it is fulfilled, the only thing that I can do is that before a contractor's tender is accepted I send an inspector down to examine his factory, and to see that the factory is so built and so constructed that he is in a position to make the quantity of clothing which he tenders for in that factory.

10843. We were told just now by a witness that within his knowledge a Government contract had been taken by a firm, with the Factory Clause in it, who had no factory and never had a factory; what do you say to that statement?

It is difficult to answer that question without knowing the name of the firm; but all that I can say on that subject is, that the firms whose tenders are accepted have factories either in London or in the country. I may as well state generally that out of a total sum of 87,000 *l.* which will be spent in wages for making up army clothing for this year, 60,000 *l.* will be spent in the Government Factory and 27,000 *l.* outside. The 27,000 *l.* outside is distributed thus: To factories at Newcastle-under-Lyne, 11,126 *l.*; Limerick, 10,641 *l.*; Derby, 1,179 *l.*, and Crewe and Swindon, 737 *l.* Then in London there is distributed to factories in Dod-street, Limehouse, 1,721 *l.*, and in Leman-street, 595 *l.* So that out of 27,000 *l.* given outside, 23,683 *l.* is distributed to factories in the country, and 2,316 *l.* only to the East-end.

10844. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Are those contracts that are going to be given out, or that have been given out?

That have been given out.

10845. They will include those that have been given out within the last two months?

Yes; that covers the contracts for the whole of last year.

10846. *Chairman.*] Is it in any way your duty to see that the Factory Clause is observed?

No; I do not consider it is.

10847. Whose duty in the War Department is that?

I do not know whether we consider it anybody's duty. It is rather the duty of the Home Office; it is the duty of the Home Office through their inspectors to see that the provisions of the Factory Act are carried out.

10848. But is there anything in the Factory Act which requires that Government contracts shall be done in a factory?

No.

10849. Then how can it be the duty of the inspector of the Home Office to see that the Factory Clause is observed?

But it is the duty of the inspector of the Home Office to see that the provisions of the Factory Act are carried out in the factories that are making Government clothing.

10850. Quite so; but in what part of the Factory Act is there a provision that the clause in your contracts shall be properly carried out?

There is no provision of that sort.

10851. Have you any arrangement with the Home Office that the factory inspector shall report to you?

No, we have none yet; that is under consideration. The clause in our tender runs thus: "All garments shall be made up at the contractor's factory at only, and no work whatever must be done at the homes of the workpeople. Any infringement of this condition, if proved to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State for War, shall render the contractor liable to a penalty not exceeding 100 *l.*, which may be deducted in the manner laid down in Clause 6, Conditions of Contract."

10852. Has that ever been estreated?

No.

10853. Do you believe that the clause has never been violated?

I should be very sorry to say that it has not, because I have no means of ascertaining positively whether it has or has not.

10854. Then all you do is to trust to the *bona fides* of the people that they will observe the clause?

And to the informer.

10855. But does the informer get anything for informing?

No.

10856. Then what interest can there be to the informer to inform?

An informer may be a competing contractor who has been disappointed of the contract.

10857. He might be; but there has never been such a person, I gather, as an informer?

No; we have never had any information of that kind given to us yet.

10858. Lord *Clinton*] But you ascertain whether the contractors have factories before you employ them?

Yes.

10859. *Chairman.*] Then what it comes to is this, that you have ascertained that the contractors had power to comply with the clause, but you have never ascertained whether they actually did comply with it or not?

No, we have never done that.

10860. Will you tell us what are the regulations with regard to putting out work at the Factory at Pimlico; do you put any work out?

Yes, we do. We have got a certain number of out-door hands; those out-door hands are dying out, and we shall not employ any more, but during certain times of pressure we had a great number of out door hands; in fact, we had at one time as many as from 750 to 800 out-door hands. We have reduced those now to 101. And then also women who are sick are allowed to take work home, under strict supervision.

10861. That is, women who are employed indoors?

Indoors, but who are obliged to be out from being sick. They are allowed to take a little work out because they like it. The average wage of 41 women who were allowed to take work out during the past year was 8 *s.* 8½ *d.* a week; therefore, you see, they do not take out much work.

10862. And are you not giving out work to any fresh hands?

To no outdoor hands.

10863. When did you begin to cease to give out work to fresh hands?

We began in 1884 and 1885.

10864. And you have given no work out to fresh hands since 1884 or 1885?

No, not outside.

10865. But do you feel yourself bound to give out work to hands whom you employed prior to that time?

Yes,

Yes, we do. There are hands we have employed for a good many years, and many of them are old and infirm; and the other day I caused an inspection at their houses of all the persons so employed, and I found that a considerable number of them are very old, and if they did not get that work would simply starve.

10866. Do they do the work themselves, or sublet it to others?
That is what I tried to ascertain, and as far as I could gather, they did not sublet it outside, but they did it amongst their families.

10867. Members of their own family?
Yes, members of their own family.

10868. But you would not hold yourself in anyway bound to offer that work to any members of the family after the hands you nominally employ die?
Certainly not; and what I have done is this: where I have found an outdoor hand, and where she has, perhaps one or two daughters who can come into the factory, I take those daughters into the factory, and discharge the outdoor hand.

10869. Do you pay the outdoor hand by the piece?
By the piece entirely.

10870. And on the same terms as in the factory?
We do not give them so much work, because the average weekly return of the permanent outdoor division is 13 *s.* a week.

10871. But the scale of prices is the same?
The scale of prices is about the same.

10872. And what is the rate of wages in the Pimlico Factory; have you any schedule of the prices?
Yes, I can give you a schedule of the piece-workers' averages during the year ending March 1888. In the indoor piece workers, for the machinists, the average weekly return was 1 *l.* 2 *s.* 11½ *d.*; and for the sewers, 14 *s.* 3 *d.* That, of course, includes all holidays, and employment all the year round.

10873. And every day in the week?
Every day in the week except holidays.

10874. And is that based upon time work or piece work?
Piece work entirely; it is all piece work.

10875. Then supposing you have not got enough work for them, do they sit idle?
There is always enough work for them; in fact, we only take on a sufficient number of hands for the work, because our work is very regular; we fix the work at between 9,000 and 10,000 garments a week, going all the year round, and the only thing that we have to do sometimes is to take on more hands for a temporary purpose, under pressure, and discharge them when the pressure is over.

10876. Is there great competition for employment?
Immense.

10877. Is there any difficulty in obtaining skilled workpeople?
No; we have no difficulty in obtaining skilled workpeople, but what we are doing now is this, we take on young girls principally and train them.

10878. And what rate do you pay them at?
They begin at 8 *s.* and 9 *s.* a week and go up, and then whenever they are sufficiently efficient to do the ordinary work they get the ordinary piecework rate.

10879. They get 8 *s.* or 9 *s.* paid by time, do you mean?
No, by piecework also; but of course they cannot do much when they first come in; they are only put on the most simple work.

10880. Do you sub-divide the work?
No, we do not sub divide the work. I see in the evidence taken before your Lordships', there has been a great deal said about women not being able to do certain work. Now we find in the factory at Pimlico that the women do the whole of the work except the cutting out and the viewing; they do the pressing and the felling, and the sewing; every part of the garment.

10881. And the machinery?
And the machinery; every part of it.

10882. And do they use a very heavy iron for pressing?
No; we have the iron worked by a lever from the foot, so that there is no trouble to work it at all. I may say that it is only since these new pressing irons have been introduced that women have been able to be employed in that work.

10883. Are the pressing irons to be worked by the foot expensive?
No, they are not very expensive.

10884. What relation would they bear to the ordinary pressing iron in point of cost?
They cost a great deal more than an ordinary pressing iron.

10885. Double as much?
Fully that; because they are heated with gas, and are kept hot all day long with gas.

10886. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Is it a large price; can you give us any idea what the actual price of one of these machines would be?
We have not bought any of these machines for a long time. This (*producing a drawing*) is an actual illustration of the iron, and I think the cost is 15 *l.*

10887. *Chairman.*] Prior to using that iron did you have to employ male labour?
Yes.

10888. And do you pay the women pressers as much as you used to do the men pressers?
The men pressers were then all time-workers; but I should think we do not pay them so much, certainly.

10889. Lord *Monkswell.*] Supposing anyone complains of an improper rejection of articles, what do you do then?
If a contractor complains of an improper rejection he can always ask for an arbitration.

10890. But supposing it is for a small amount?
Then of course he does not ask for an arbitration.

10891. But does he not carry his complaint beyond the inspector. You say you trust the inspector entirely?
He carries his complaint to the Director of Contracts.

10892. It is sent to you first, I understand?
Yes.

10893. And then, if he is not satisfied with what you say, he goes to the Director of Contracts?
The contractor would appeal to the Director of Contracts, and the Director of Contracts would send the appeal down to me; I would then investigate it and inquire into it, and if the Director of Contracts does not agree or does not think that the inquiry is sufficient, he would then send it on to superior authority.

10894. How do you find out about the standing of the contractors who tender?
The Director of Contracts ascertains that from local inquiries.

10895. You

10895. You do nothing in regard to that?
No.

10896. But I think you said just now that you and he and one other person were the board who decided?
No; I said this, that when the tenders come in they are opened in the presence of three persons; then they are scheduled; and if it is a clothing or a cloth contract or a boot contract, it is sent down to me with an inquiry as to what course I should recommend. I then go into it very carefully, and I make my recommendations as to the tender that should be accepted.

10897. You are the person who recommends?
Yes, that goes to the Director of Contracts. If it is the lowest tender, and we are both agreed, the tender is accepted as a matter of course; but if it is not the lowest tender it must go for the decision of the Financial Secretary.

10898. But how can he form a decision?
He can only form an opinion on the papers before him.

10899. Would you not yourself, and would not the Director of Contracts, go very largely upon the opinion of those below you in the Pimlico Factory?
Certainly; we are obliged to do so.

10900. There being such a great deal of competition for these contracts, as you have told us there is, does not that afford some colour to the complaints of some people that you may be influenced by the opinion of those below you, who again may be influenced by bribes?
No, I do not see that; because, in the first place, suppose that tenders come in from A., B., C., and D., D.'s, we will suppose, is the lowest; we go into D.'s history and character.

10901. But what material have you for doing that?
We have the materials of his past contracts, and whether they have been well or ill executed.

10902. And if he has not contracted before?
If he has not contracted before then we invariably give him a trial order.

10903. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Have you had any informal complaint of contractors violating the Factory Clause of their contracts?
No, nothing beyond just hearsay.

10904. Hearsay is rather what I meant?
I have had hearsay complaints.

10905. Have you ever inquired into them?
No, I do not think I have, beyond what I have seen in the papers. The only case that I have heard of, of a breach of the Factory Act, is a case in a Post Office contract the other day; and the contractor has assured us that all his garments are made in the factory.

10906. Because we have had a witness here this morning who said that formal complaints of these violations of the Factory Clause were very seldom made, but that very often it was known to the people at the Clothing Department in an entirely informal way from allusions in conversation and things of that sort; is that so?
No; I think that whenever a statement reaches the ears of the Director of Contracts he always makes inquiries and ascertains whether there is any foundation for it.

10907. You always investigate a suspicious case?
And ascertain whether there is any foundation for the complaint.

10908. *Chairman.*] I observe that on that Paper which you handed in just now the price of those irons is marked as 15 *l.*?
I think that is about the price, because they are very heavy, and there is a great

great deal of machinery about them; but they last a great number of years; I do not think we have had any new pressing irons for nearly 20 or 25 years.

10909. Lord *Clifford of Chudleigh.*] Did I understand you to say that these pressing machines have been invented 25 years?

I think it was about 20 years ago, or nearly 20 years ago.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Monday next, at Eleven o'clock.

Die Lunæ, 30° Julii, 1888

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of DERBY.
Earl of ONSLOW.
Lord CLINTON.
Lord CLIFFORD OF CHUDLEIGH.
Lord FOXFORD (*Earl of Limerick*).
Lord KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*).
Lord MONKSWELL.
Lord THRING.

LORD KENRY (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl*), IN THE CHAIR.

MR. THOMAS CLARKE, having been re-called; is further Examined, as follows:

10910. *Chairman.*] I BELIEVE you wish to explain something that has been given in evidence before the Committee?

Yes; in Mr. Maple's evidence on the 22nd June, at Question 5799, on page 572. The question is: "I understood you to say that in some cases the names of other firms had been suppressed or not mentioned, with the object of showing that your firm carried on a business in a way not customary in the trade, and it is that charge that you are now meeting"; and Mr. Maple's answer is: "Yes We manufacture all bedding on the premises, although but few other firms that I am aware of in the whole of London besides ourselves do the same. Messrs. Gillow, Collinson, and Lock, and most of the old West-end houses (who are so jealous of the business we do) buy, if not all their bedding, most of it, and are possibly unaware as to the condition of the shops and the workpeople who manufacture the bedding they sell, whereas my firm has made on our premises, every single piece of bedding sold by us for the last 15 years." I wish to say that so far as our name is concerned, that evidence is untrue, as regards the manufacture of bedding. We manufacture our bedding on our own premises, and always have done so. To be strictly accurate, during the last 10 years we have in cases of emergency bought 17 sets of bedding; that means a set and a-half a year; and with that exception all the bedding that we have manufactured has been made on our own premises.

10911. In London?

In London, and our branch establishments.

10912. Earl of *Limerick.*] What do you mean by your "branch establishments"?

We have a branch in Lancaster, and we have one in Manchester, and one in Liverpool.

10913. They all belong to your firm?

Yes, they all belong to one firm.

10914. Lord *Clinton.*] Were those 17 sets for one order?

No; they were supplied over a period of ten years, and during that period the sets of bedding that we have made have been numbered by thousands; and therefore I wish you to see that practically we manufacture all the bedding that we sell, on our own premises. A hurried order might come in for a set of bedding for six o'clock at night, and if we had no man at liberty that we could put on it we would buy it. And these 17 sets were made by the first manufacturer of wholesale bedding in England; the man who manufactures the very best bedding of all kinds and descriptions.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. SIDNEY HERBERT KING, is called in; and having been sworn, is Examined, as follows:

10915. *Chairman.*] ARE you a member of the firm of Hebbert and Company?
I am a member of that firm.

10916. One of the partners?
Yes, one of the partners.

10917. I think your firm has been mentioned in evidence before the Committee, has it not?
It has.

10918. Have you anything you wish to say as regards the evidence that has been given concerning your firm?
Yes; with reference to the evidence given by Mr. Madden, on page 768, in answer to Question 7953. Speaking of Messrs. Hebbert, the witness says, "They give the work out of doors, and in looking over the people who work for them out of doors I find one trouser maker, a woman, finishing for 7 *s.* a dozen trousers belonging to Her Majesty's Customs." That is absolutely untrue, and in the same evidence, at Question 7956, where reference is made to the same trousers for Her Majesty's Customs, he goes on to say: "Then there is a gentleman by the name of Templinski; this gentleman makes trousers for 11 *s.* per dozen as a whole; takes them from Hebbert's Factory, and completes them as a whole for 11 *s.* dozen." I do not know the man, and I have never seen him or heard his name before I saw it in this evidence. Then the next question put to the witness was "What sort of trousers?" and his reply was "I should take them to belong to the Post Office, from what I have seen." We have not had anything to do with the Post Office for three years past, until May of this year.

10919. You say that it is not correct that one trouser maker, a woman, was paid for finishing trousers for you at 7 *s.* a dozen?
It is not correct.

10920. Do you mean to say that trousers are not finished for you at that price?
No. Trousers are finished inside at a lower price than that; we should never think of paying such a high price as that for finishing.

10921. What do you mean by "inside"?
Inside the factory. And the case mentioned here is that of a woman who had been working for us for many years, and her husband was out of his mind, and she begged me to give them work at their own home, which I did at 18 *s.* per dozen, these very trouser people.

10922. What would they cost inside per pair?
Fivepence per pair; and a quick woman can do one pair in an hour, and an average woman, or one beyond the average, would do one in an hour and a quarter.

10923. How many hours work inside is it?
From nine in the morning until eight in the evening, with an hour and a half for meal times.

10924. Lord *Clinton.*] Is that finishing?
Only finishing.

10925. But when you give it out, it is making altogether?
Making the complete article.

10926. *Chairman.*] But the answer is: "I find one trouser maker, a woman, finishing for 7 *s.* a dozen." I understood you to say that you paid 18 *s.* per dozen for finishing?
No, for making the complete article; the whole pair of trousers.

10927. What

10927. What do you pay outside for finishing?
We do not give the work outside to be finished at all; we finish everything in our own factory.

10928. Then you say that you have not given any work to any one by the name of Templinski?
No, we have not.

10929. I do not clearly understand the meaning of this answer: "There is a gentleman by the name of Templinski; this gentleman makes trousers for 11 *s.* per dozen as a whole; takes them from Hebbert's factory and completes them as a whole for 11 *s.* a dozen"?
It is supposed that he takes them out to make and makes them, the complete article, and brings them back dressed in the complete state for 11 *s.* per dozen.

10930. Would that be an ordinary price?
It would be a very fair price indeed.

10931. You say you have made no Post Office trousers for the last three years until last May?
Until this May. There is another remark made which I wish to contradict. On page 785, at Question 8149, the question is asked, "You say that Messrs. Hebbert put out the Post Office contract to a sub-contractor?" and the witness, Zeitlin, says, "Yes." I deny that; because we have nothing whatever to give out. We are bound under contract not to give any work out, and we do not do so; we are making it all in our own factory at the present moment. Then a further question is asked "When was that?" and the reply is: "That was last year" (I have told your Lordships that we have not had the contract for some three years until this May), "but an agreement was signed this year as well to make them for 2 *s.* and 1 *s.* 8 *d.* a coat" (that is referring to the Post Office tunics), "but I have never yet seen them making them, because I have never happened to be in their shops." The agreement was signed for these prices, but before the contract was settled we were ordered to find security that we should make everything in our own factory, and consequently we have made every thing in the factory, and not given anything outside; so the agreement fell to the ground.

10932. I understand that it was your custom to put out the Government work?
We have only had a factory two and-a-half years, and previous to that we gave out work. We gave out work to a man of the name of Bamberger, who has always done Post Office work for every person who has had it to make.

10933. But latterly you have been prohibited from putting it out?
Since the new contract, for the first time, the clause has been inserted preventing us putting it out.

10934. Therefore you make it on your own premises?
We make everything on our own premises.

10935. Earl of *Limerick.*] What is the date of the new contract?
The beginning of this year; March of this year.

10936. *Chairman.*] Have you any other statement that you wish to bring before us?
No other statement that I wish to contradict.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

APPENDIX.

LIST OF APPENDIX.

Appendix A.

Paper handed in by Mr. John Burnett, 27th April 1888: PAGE

Letter from the Scottish National Operative Tailors' Society, dated 14 April 1888 - 1023

Extracts from Report of Scottish Tailors on the Sweating System in Glasgow - - 1023

Appendix B.

Paper handed in by Mr. W. Hoffman:

Letter in relation to the Sweating System, as practised in the Boot Trade, dated 18 May 1888 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 1025

Sweaters in the County Court:—Important decision - - - - - - - 1025

Appendix C.

Paper handed in by Mr. Lionel Alexander, 19th June 1888:

Form of Questions sent to certain Schools in reference to Children of Foreigners - 1027

Appendix D.

Paper handed in by Mr. Joseph George Plum, 23rd July 1888:

The Army and Navy Co-operative Society (Limited).—Tailors' log - - - - 1029

APPENDIX.

Appendix A.

PAPER handed in by Mr. *John Burnett*, 27 April 1888.

Scottish National Operative Tailors' Society.

62, Dalry-road, Edinburgh,
14 April 1888.

Mr. Burnett.

Dear Sir,—I have just got to hand the Report of parties appointed to investigate the Sweating System in Glasgow. It has been a matter of some difficulty with them, and I understand that two of them have been sacrificed for their share in the work. In all towns of any size we have always a class who are hanging between the position of journeyman and sweater, and to us they are a source of annoyance and danger, especially in times of trade disputes, but with these I am afraid the Government can do nothing except by the strict enforcement and some amendment of the Factory and Workshops Act. In Glasgow, however, there exists a second East-end of London, and any legislative enactment affecting the one would be equally applicable to the other. * * * *

I am, &c.
(signed) *N. M'Lean*, Secretary.

Extracts from Report of Scottish Tailors on the Sweating System in Glasgow.

"We do not enter into particulars as to the means taken to procure entry into the sweaters' premises, but it will be easily understood that the work was of a difficult and arduous nature, so much so that we had to abandon the original intention of going over the whole city. This was owing to the want of accurate knowledge as to the exact locality of the sweaters' shops or houses, and because the most dangerous from a sanitary point of view usually give no indication of their presence. It is believed that there are some two or three thousand persons (not Jews or other foreigners) engaged in this class of trade, and as one-fourth of the population of this city live in one-roomed houses, it is apparent that the public is in imminent danger of infectious and contagious disease from this source, while the people themselves eke out a miserable existence on starvation wages."

The Report then goes on to urge the necessity of a Government commissioner being sent down to examine and report on the state of the trade in Glasgow.

From cases stated in detail it would appear that the Scottish sweaters are quite as numerous as the foreigners and of quite as low a type. A few cases may be quoted in which the information given is most definite and precise.

1. "Herman Harris (Jew), 63, Candleriggs, employs about 20 hands, principally females. Two male pressers. This place was in a most dilapidated condition, and looks as if it has not been cleaned for years. Works for Hunter, Barr & Co., Jamaica-street, and A. W. Peden, 18, Trongate. Prices: boys' tweed jackets, 11 *d.*; men's, 1 *s.* 4 *d.*; men's coats, 2 *s.* 3 *d.* Can turn out from 100 to 200 per week. Since the above was written these premises have been burnt through the overheating of the stove."

"R. Kelman, 114, Trongate, occupies a house of three rooms, all of which are used as workrooms and dwelling. Usually employs about 10 hands, and finds no difficulty in getting workers. Chiefly employed on boys' clothing. Prices: 11 *d.* per suit of jacket and knickerbockers; youths' or men's suits, 2 *s.* per suit."

"J. Prosner (Jew), 35, King-street, Tradeston.—This is a wholesale sweater, and has a large workshop in an old disused hayloft above an engineer's shed. Here are employed as many as 40 hands in the busy season. Work is done for London and country firms. Prices: men's jackets, 1 *s.* 9 *d.*; shooting coats, 2 *s.* 3 *d.*; overcoats, 2 *s.* 9 *d.*; trousers, 11 *d.* per pair; and vests, 11 *d.* each."

"Hyman Jacobs (Jew), another wholesale sweater, who carries on work under the ory or division of labour system, with nine machinists, nine finishers, and three pressers. They work often till 10 o'clock and are not interfered with. He was making Volunteer uniforms for a London firm; the tunics 1 *s.* each, and boys' clothing, 2 *s.* per suit."

"Benjamin Jacobs, brother of the above, carries on a similar business."

 "G. Poyner

"G. Poyner (Jew), 9, Maxwell-street, wholesale sweater, occupies six rooms, all of which are used as workrooms during the day. He deludes the Inspector by denying that he has women working for him, but in reality he employs about 20 women. This was the dirtiest house it was our misfortune to visit."

"A. Smith, Park-place, has a house of three rooms, two of which are used as workrooms. Very dirty. Employs five or six hands. Used to carry on a very extensive sweating business, but complains that the Jews have undersold him and pushed him out of the trade to a large extent."

"John M'Lean, 3, Adelphi-street, wholesale and export clothing. Premises clean and well kept. Saw from 30 to 40 women all busy, and three pressers. He said the legal hours were strictly observed. We had been making independent inquiry, and learned that the hours were not observed, as they were often employed very late at night, and even at that can scarcely make a living, as the prices paid were so low."

"W. Wink, 118, Eglinton-street.—Five-roomed house, three being used as workshops. This place is notorious for sweating under the premium system, *i.e.*, no pay while learning. Employs about 20 hands when busy."

"E. Forbes, 28, Nelson-street, machines trousers at 2½ *d.* per pair, and an additional 2 *d.* per pair is paid for finishing."

"A. Nelson, 80, Gallowgate, employs 50 women. Prices: trousers, 9 *s.* per dozen pairs; vests, 8 *s.* per dozen; coats or jackets, 14 *s.* per dozen."

"Mrs. Grundie, trousers maker, employed by Nelson, Gallowgate, receives 4½ *d.* per pair, and finds her own thread."

"G. and H. M'Cormick, 21, Surrey-street, doing work at fair prices (13 *s.* to 17 *s.* per suit)."

"R. Fraser undertakes work for the trade, but has good prices (16 *s.* to 19 *s.* per suit)."

"Marks Solomon, 17, Hospital-street, up an outside staircase; all the surroundings were of a most objectionable character. Inside, matters were, if possible, worse. A bed in the kitchen filled up with work in the course of being made up. In the next room a machine and a few jobs lying about. A very small place. The smell and stifling atmosphere caused us to beat a hasty retreat."

Appendix B.

PAPER handed in by Mr. *W. Hoffman.*

Sir, 18 May 1888.

When I appeared before the Select Committee of the House of Lords to give evidence on the sweating system as practised in the boot trade, I made reference to the practise of certain firms of binding their men by means of agreement, and deducting certain sums weekly from their wages, thus preventing them from obtaining higher wages during the busy season of the year.

I beg to enclose herewith, for their Lordships' Committee, a report of a case which recently came into the Shoreditch County Court, which fully bears out my statement on this head, and also gives the name of one of the firms, which I did not care to give when giving my evidence, because I had no documentary evidence. I was present in the court at the hearing of this case, and, if their Lordships think it desirable, I beg to hand in this case as part of my evidence.

Yours, &c.
(signed) *W. Hoffman.*

Hon. E. Thesiger,
Clerk to the Committee.

Sweaters in the County Court.

Important Decision.

In the Shoreditch County Court, on Tuesday, a laster, named Cohen sued Messrs. Lion Brothers, of Phipps-street, Finsbury, for the sum of 13 *s.* 3 *d.*, being 1 *s.* 3 *d.* for lasting seven pairs of boots, and 12 *s.* for money deducted from his wages in weekly instalments, which the firm refused to repay him.

The plaintiff stated that the firm made certain deductions from his wages every week, which since October last amounted to the sum of 12 *s.*, which he now claimed; but, because he refused to do any more work for the firm, Messrs. Lion refused to give it to him. The witness, who was very vociferous, said he left because he could not get a living. "Fancy making seven pairs of boots for 1 *s.* 3 *d.*! I couldn't stand it any longer."

The representative of Messrs. Lion explained to his Honour that his firm employed a very large number of hands, and that in the boot trade there were slack and busy seasons, and it had often happened that when they had given men employment in the slack seasons, as soon as the busy time came round the workmen would leave them and go elsewhere, where they could get higher wages. In order to prevent this Messrs. Lion had drawn up an agreement which all their workmen had to sign, and which agreement the plaintiff had also signed, and, having violated this agreement, they contended that he had forfeited the money which the firm had deducted.

The agreement bearing the plaintiff's signature was here handed up to the judge, and in substance was as follows:—"We, the lasters and finishers, agree to deposit 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a week, to be deducted from our wages weekly from this date, for twelve months, and should we leave before that time we forfeit that money to Lion Brothers That we shop three times a week, and do the work satisfactorily. If we are discharged, the reason shall be entered into our work-book, and our money shall be returned."

Judge, to Plaintiff: Why did you sign this agreement if you object to it?

Plaintiff: "I did not know what I was signing." He went on to say that he did not know that he was to be bound down in the busy time, and that he could not read much. He refused to be bound like a soldier to starvation wages. Looking round the Court, he repeated, indignantly, "Just fancy making seven pairs of shoes for 1 *s.* 3 *d.*"

A foreman of Messrs. Lion's proved the plaintiff's signature to the agreement, and stated that when Cohen refused to take any more work out, both he (witness) and Mr. Lion urged him to go on working, as the firm were most unwilling to stop the man's money, as they were entitled to do by the terms of the agreement; but, as Cohen persisted in his refusal, they were compelled to enforce their rights, because they employed many hands.

The Plaintiff, interrupting: "You are large employers of sweaters and cheap labour."

Witness continuing: On 4th April, he gave plaintiff 150 pairs of work; of this order the plaintiff brought in two pairs short. The firm now made a counter-claim of 5 *s.*

Cohen again interposed, and assured his Honour that the outside value of the boots was 10 *d.* per pair.

His Honour, to Plaintiff: You should not have signed this agreement, but, as you have done so, you must be bound by it.

Plaintiff: But if your Honour will read the agreement, it does not say that they are to treat us as dogs, as they do, and pay us 2½ *d.* a pair for lasting boots. I can't stand it.

In the result, his Honour gave judgment for the plaintiff for the 1 *s.* 3 *d.* wages, and allowed 1 *s.* 3 *d.* as a counter-claim to Messrs. Lion for the two pairs of boots, both sides to pay their own costs. The plaintiff was nonsuited as regards the 12 *s.* deducted from his wages.

In the same Court another laster, named Cohen, of 7, Middlesex-street, E., sued Mr. Wilkins, boot manufacturer, of Chiswell-street, Finsbury, for 7 *s.* 8 *d.* deducted in payment for two pairs of boots, said by Mr. Wilkins to have been cut round the seats in several places. The boots were produced in court, and submitted to the judge, who said he could see no cuts. Mr. Wilkins, on examining the boots, said that the seats had been relasted, and the fitting of the boots spoiled. This, however, the plaintiff denied. Mr. Wilkins further complained that this man had spoiled other work of his, 22 pairs of which he had to sell at a reduction in consequence of bad work. When he took him on he expected he was going to do the work himself, instead of which he employed others to do it; in fact, he was a sweater, and he refused to employ sweaters.

Cohen denied this impeachment, but a little boy, who was called as a witness on his behalf, in cross-examination said he was not quite 14 years old; he worked for Cohen, and lasted in the sides and seats, and had been at it for the last two years. His wages were now 5 *s.* a week, and he worked from eight a.m. to eight p.m.

Judgment was given for the plaintiff for the amount claimed, and costs for two witnesses, the boots to be delivered to Mr. Wilkins.

Appendix C.

PAPER handed in by Mr. *Lionel Alexander*, 19th June 1888.

Form of Questions sent to certain Schools.

1. How many Foreign Children are there in the above School?	3. Please state approximately and concisely the period that the above Children have attended School, and also their ages (as being completed "years old")?
2. How many Children are there in the School whose Father is (or was, if dead) a Foreigner?	4. What has been the Average Number in this School, during each of the last 10 years, of the Children of Foreigners?

Replies to foregoing Questions.

School.	Question 1. Number of Foreign-born.	Question 2. Number of English-born and Foreign Parentage.
Jews' Free School - - - - - -	897	1,962
Bayswater Jewish School - - - -	15	105
Jews' Infant School - - - - -	213	1,098
Westminster Jews' Free School - - -	49	385
Stepney Jewish Schools - - - - -	6	179
Borough Jewish Schools - - - - -	5	43
Chicksand-street Board School - - -	790	900
Old Castle-street - ditto - - - -	300	1,200
Settle-street - - ditto - - - -	230	486
Berner-street - - ditto - - - -	267	261
Gravel-lane - - ditto - - - -	60	130
	2,832	6,749

Grand Total - - - 9,581.

QUESTION 3 (Part 1).—Number of Years in School.—Foreigners and Children of Foreigners.

4 Jewish Schools and 1 Board School.

SCHOOL.	Under 1 Year.	1 Year.	2 Years.	3 Years.	4 Years.	5 Years and upwards.
Jews' Free School - - - -	637	561	530	463	428	240
Jews' Infant School - - -	76	64	37	27	9	—
Westminster Jews' Free School -	121	38	53	41	39	93
Bayswater Jewish Schools - -	- -	20	14	11	26	49
Chicksand-street Board School -	240	200	180	140	100	50
Totals - - -	1,074	883	814	682	602	432

GRAND TOTAL - - - 4,487 Children, giving an average of about 2½ years each in School.

QUESTION 3 (Part 2).—Ages of Children.—Foreigners and Children of Foreigners.

In 3 Jewish Schools.

SCHOOL.	Aged 4.	Aged 5.	Aged 6.	Aged 7.	Aged 8.	Aged 9.	Aged 10.	Aged 11.	Aged 12.	Aged 13.	Aged 14.	Aged 15.
Jews' Free School -	–	–	48	287	522	545	580	495	313	62	7	–
Westminster Jews' Free School.	26	34	52	58	45	45	35	46	37	7	--	–
Bayswater Jewish Schools.	11	15	10	10	12	9	14	11	16	7	3	2
Totals - -	37	49	110	355	579	599	629	552	366	76	10	2

GRAND TOTAL - - - 3,364 Children, at an average of about 9⅓ years old each.

QUESTION 4.

Only one school, Settle-street, attempts to reply, and that of too small dimensions to mark any special average, particularly, as being a Board School, the tendency has been within the last 10 years towards an increase of Jewish Children, owing to the expansion of the Communal Schools not having been adequate to the increased numbers to be educated.

Appendix D.

PAPER handed in by Mr. *Joseph George Plum*, 23rd July 1888.

THE ARMY AND NAVY CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETY (LIMITED).

TAILORS' LOG.

Dress and Frock Coats.

	s.	d.
Superfine, with cuts in breast and gorge, padding in shoulders, stitched sides, three pockets, two-hole button cuff, double breasted -	18	0
All others, made same as above - -	17	0
Superfine, single breasted, made as above - - - - - - -	17	0
All others, single breasted, made as above - - - - - - -	16	0
Extras:		
All ordinary pockets, above three, each - - - - - - -	0	6
Pockets across waist, with hole and button - - - - - -	0	9
Outside pocket with flap - - -	0	9
Edges bound, felled - - -	1	0
Flat braided, both sides to bottom of facing - - - - - - -	3	0
Galloon binding, backed stitched one side - - - - - - -	2	6
Corded edges - - - - - -	1	6
Corded edges, stitched behind - -	2	6
Double stitched edges - - -	2	0
Stoated and double pricked edges -	3	0
Silk breast facings - - - -	1	0
Silk facings, short - - - -	0	9
American shoulders - - -	1	0
Interlining back and fore parts with domette - - - - - -	1	0
Interlining sleeves and fore parts with domette - - - -	0	6
Hair cloth in shoulders, bound - -	0	6
Cuts in waist, seamed and rantered -	0	6
Capping sleeve linings - - -	0	6
Three-hole button cuff - - -	0	6
Four „ „ „ - - -	1	0
Wadding in shoulders - - -	0	3
Strapped seams - - - -	4	0
Lapped seams, single stitched - -	2	0
„ „ double „ - -	3	0
Oilskin in front of scye - - -	0	3
Extra size, 44 breast and over - -	1	0
Full baste - - - - - -	1	6

Morning Coats.

	s.	d.
Superfine, three pockets, and flaps, padding in shoulders, two rows stitching round arm holes, cuts in gorge, and two-hole button cuff - -	15	0
All others made as above - - -	14	0
Extras:		
Double breasted - - - -	1	0
Elastic wristlets at hand - - -	1	0
Tab to collar - - - - -	0	6
Saddle flap - - - - -	0	6
All other Extras as above.		
Full baste - - - - - -	1	6

Pea Coats.

	s.	d.
Superfine, three pockets, slit behind, cuts under arms - - - -	12	6
All others made as above - - -	11	6
Extras:		
Double breasted - - - -	1	0
Slits at side - - - - -	0	6
All other Extras as above.		
Full baste - - - - - -	1	6

Serge Pea Coats.

	s.	d.
Single breasted, three pockets, lined or unlined, with seams felled - -	10	6
All other Extras as above.		
Full baste - - - - - -	1	0

Flannel Pea Coats.

	s.	d.
Single breasted, three pockets, lined or unlined, with seams felled - -	9	0
Extras:		
Double breasted - - - - -	1	0
All other Extras as above.		
Full baste - - - - - -	1	0

Norfolk Jackets.

	s.	d.
Four plaits, three pockets, patched or otherwise, yoke and belt, two-button cuff or wristbands, lined, or unlined with felled seams -	15	0
Extras:		
Gun pads on shoulders - - -	1	0
Other Extras as above.		
Full baste - - - - - -	1	6
Serge and Flannel, made as above -	12	6

Scarlet Hunting Coats.

Single breasted, three pockets, two-button cuff, padding in shoulders, and ring at neck - - - -	21	0
Extras:		
Double breasted - - - -	1	0
All other Extras as above.		
Full baste - - - - - -	2	6

Covert Coats.

Superfine, three pockets, two-button cuff, padding in shoulders, fly front or double breasted, cuts under arms - - - - - - -	16	6
All others made as above - - -	15	0
Extras:		
Strapped seams - - - -	4	0
Lapped seams, double stitched -	3	0
„ „ single „ -	2	0
All rows of stitching on cuffs above four, per pair - - - -	0	3
Covered rings, per dozen - -	1	0
„ buttons „ - - -	0	6
Other Extras as above.		
Full baste - - - - - -	1	6

Chesterfields.

Superfine, single breasted, with fly, or double breasted, lined, or unlined, with felled seams - - - -	16	6
All others made as above - - -	15	0
Extras:		
Taped seams, opened and felled each side - - - - - - -	1	0
Taped all over, including sleeves -	2	6
Fly behind, with one or two holes -	0	6
„ „ „ three or four holes	1	0
Each tab to skirt - - - -	0	3
Fur collar when coat is finished -	1	0
„ facings „ „ „ -	1	0
„ cuffs „ „ „ -	1	0
All other Extras as above.		

Ulsters.

Single breasted, three pockets - -	14	0
Extras:		
Fly front or double breasted - -	1	0
Tabs to cuff - - - - - -	0	6
Ticket pocket - - - - - -	0	6
Whole belt - - - - - -	1	0
Half „ - - - - - -	0	6
Hood, lined or unlined, sewn on -	1	6
„ „ „ detached -	2	0
Short cape, on or off - - -	1	6
Long cape „ „ - - -	2	6
Other Extras as above.		

Inverness Capes.

	s.	d.
With sleeves - - - - - -	15	0
Without sleeves - - - - -	12	0

Trousers.

Fly front or whole fall, two pockets, stitched round tops, front of fly and catch, tops turned in or bound.		
First Quality.—Including doeskins, Bedford cords, Venetians, super and all faced cloths, satarras, beavers, velvets, velveteens, kersey, treble whipcords, treble Bliss's tweeds, treble meltons, and black and blue diagonals - - -	6	3
Second Quality.—Made same as above, including all other diagonals, silk mixtures, thin meltons, worsted coatings, pilots, and other materials not named above - - - -	5	3
Extras:		
Notched or lapped seams, doeskins only - - - - - - -	1	0
Notched or lapped seams, all others -	0	6
Split falls - - - - - -	1	0
Long strap and buckle - - -	0	9
Short „ „ - - - -	0	6
Fobs, each - - - - - -	0	3
Cash or pistol pocket, with flap hole and button - - - - - -	0	9
Leather all round bottoms - -	1	0
„ at heels - - - - -	0	6
Lining - - - - - - -	1	0
Bottom buttons, stayed and stitched	0	6
French bearer - - - - -	0	6
Braid down side seams - - -	1	0
Puff in back, silk or cotton - -	0	3
„ „ elastic - - -	0	6
Clasp - - - - - - -	0	3
Faced bottoms - - - - -	0	6
Large seat lining, 12 in. by 12 in. -	0	6
Bottoms faced with cloth or canvas 6 in. up - - - - - -	0	6
Bottoms faced with cloth or canvas above - - - - - - -	0	9
Footstraps, same material - -	1	0
Loops for belt - - - - -	0	6
Strapping leg seam, and 8 in. up seat, double sewn - - - - -	3	6
Strapping leg seam and to top of seat, double sewn - - - - -	4	0
Strapping leg seam 6 in. up, seat $8\frac{1}{2}$ in., and 3 in. up front, double sewn - - - - - - -	2	0
Knee strapping, double sewn - -	1	6
Cuts in top, taped - - - -	0	3
Extra size, 44 waist and over - -	0	6
Full baste - - - - - -	1	3
Forward baste - - - - -	0	3

Serge and Flannel Trousers.

Two pockets, strap and buckle, and loops - - - - - - -	4	6
Extras as above.		
Full baste - - - - - -	0	9
Forward baste - - - - -	0	3

Pantaloons.

	s.	d.
Two pockets, stitched all round tops, front of fly and catch - - -	8	9
Extras:		
If buckskin cloth - - - - -	0	6
Other Extras as trousers.		
Full baste - - - - - -	1	3

Breeches.

	s.	d.
Fly front, whole fall, two pockets, stitched round tops, front of fly and catch - - - - - - -	7	9
Extras:		
If buckskin cloth - - - - -	0	6
Continuations, linen or stockinette -	1	6
,, same material - -	2	0
Other Extras as trousers.		
Full baste, with or without continuations - - - - - - -	1	3

Gaiters.

	s.	d.
With tongue - - - - - -	5	6
Without tongue - - - - - -	5	0
Basting - - - - - - -	0	6

Knickerbockers.

	s.	d.
Two pockets, with or without plaited tops, knees made up with elastic, or buckle garter - - - - -	6	3
All Extras as trousers.		
Full baste - - - - - -	1	3
Forward baste - - - - -	0	3

Vests.

	s.	d.
Single breasted, bound, swelled or doubled stitched, three pockets, super or tweed - - - - -	4	0
Extras:		
Double breasted - - - -	0	6
Double breasted, lapels sewn on -	1	0
Inside breast pocket, with hole and button - - - - - -	0	6
Fobs, and eye glass pockets, each -	0	3
Tracing braid, per row - - -	0	6
Fancy wool with fly, bound cloth -	5	6
,, cords ,, bound - -	5	6
Seal skins ,, - - -	5	6
Astrachan ,, - - -	5	6
Quilted lining, fore part only ½ inch square - - - - - -	1	6
Quilted lining, fore part and back -	2	6

Youths' Dress and Frock Coats.

	s.	d.
Superfine, cuts in breast and gorge, padding in shoulders, stitched sides, three pockets, two-button cuff:		
Chest 34 inches - - - - -	17	0
,, 32 ,, - - - - -	16	0
,, 30 ,, - - - - -	15	0
If single breasted, less - - -	1	0
Extras same as gents.'		

Youths' Morning Coats.

	s.	d.
Superfine, made as gents.':		
Chest 34 inches - - - - -	13	0
,, 32 ,, - - - - -	12	0
,, 30 ,, - - - - -	11	0
All others as above, less - - -	1	0
Extras as in gents.'		

Youths' Lounge or Pea Coats.

	s.	d.
Superfine, three pockets, single breasted, three seams, with collar:		
Chest 34 inches - - - - -	11	0
,, 32 ,, - - - - -	10	0
,, 28 ,, - - - - -	9	0
Under 28 inches chest, less - -	1	0
All others, less - - - - - -	1	0

Youths' Chesterfields.

	s.	d.
Superfine, three pockets, three seams:		
Chest 34 inches - - - - -	14	0
,, 32 ,, - - - - -	13	0
,, 30 ,, - - - - -	12	0
All others, less - - - - - -	1	0

Boys' Eton Jackets.

	s.	d.
Superfine, two pockets in or out, padding in shoulders:		
Chest 30 inches and upwards - -	10	6
All others made as above, same size -	9	6
Superfine, made same as above:		
Chest 28 to 30 inches - - -	9	6
All others, same size - - - -	8	6

Boys' Eton Vests.

	s.	d.
Superfine, three pockets, all sizes -	3	6
All others - - - - - - -	3	0

Youths' Trousers.

	s.	d.
Superfine, two pockets, made same as Gents.':		
Waist 28 inches and upwards - -	5	9
Others made as above, same size - -	4	9
Superfine, waist 26 to 28 inches, made as above - - - - - - -	5	3
Others made as above, same size -	4	3
Superfine, waist 25 to 26 inches, made as above - - - - - -	4	9
Others made as above, same size - -	3	9

Ladies' Habits.

	s.	d.
Body—Superfine, and all other materials, except serge, tweed, and cheviots, stand or fall collar, flat braided or double stitched, stitched round nipple, watch-pocket, and belt to fasten with hooks and eyes, or otherwise, with two cuts in front, and two-hole button cuff - -	19	0
All others made same as above - -	17	6
Extras:		
Cut under arm - - - - -	0	6
Holes and buttons down front - -	1	6
Whalebone at back - - -	0	6
All Skirts, with three cuts and waistband	4	0
Extras:		
Lap cut, with fly and pocket - -	2	0
Extra cuts, each - - - - -	0	3
Lining seat and knee - - -	1	6
Footstraps, each - - - - -	0	3

Ladies' Trousers.

	s.	d.
Cloth Trousers, lined chamois leather, footstraps, and strap and buckle -	7	6
Extras—If chamois uppers and cloth bottoms - - - - - -	1	0

Ladies' Pantaloons.

Chamois uppers, cloth bottoms, strap and buckle, open with buttons and holes to knee - - - - -	9	6

Ladies' Breeches.

Cloth, lined chamois leather, strap and buckle - - - - - -	8	0
Leggings, same as Gents.'		
Gaiters " "		

Liveries.

Full Dress Coatees.

With notched holes across breast, on flaps, and on cuffs, including all extras except piping - - -	17	6
Plain edges - - - - - -	15	0
Extras—Piping - - - - - -	3	0

Coatees.

Plain edges - - - - - -	15	0
Extras—Piping - - - - - -	3	0

Coachmen's Frock Coats.

Three pockets, plain edges - - -	14	6
Extras:		
One extra pocket - - - - -	0	6
Piping - - - - - - -	3	0

Grooms' Frock Coats.

Same as Coachmen's.

Butlers' Dress Coats.

Made same as Gents.' - - - -	17	0

Servants' Morning Coats.

Three pockets, swelled edges - -	12	6
All extra pockets, each - - -	0	6

Servants' Pea Coats.

Three pockets, swelled edges - -	10	6
All extra pockets, each - - -	0	6
Double breast - - - - - -	1	0

Box Coats.

Edges double stitched, &c. - - -	16	0
Extras—Lap seams - - - - -	3	0
All the above, basting, each - -	1	6

Page Box Coats.

Making - - - - - - -	15	0
Basting - - - - - - -	1	6

Page Jackets.

	s.	d.
With one pocket, studs, hooks and eyes, or button holes, buttons on cuff	10	0
Extras:		
Edges and collar piped - - -	1	6
Piped all round - - - -	2	0
If more than one row of buttons, buttons per dozen - - -	0	6
Basting - - - - - - -	1	0

Servants' Trousers.

Superfine, two pockets, stitched round tops, front of fly and catch - -	5	9
Extras:		
Lap seams - - - - - -	1	0
Piping - - - - - - -	1	0
Lining - - - - - - -	1	0
Large seat lining, 12 in. by 12 in. -	0	6
Full baste - - - - - -	1	0
Forward baste - - - - -	0	3
Other Extras same as Gents.'		
All others made same as above - -	4	9
Extras—Lap seams - - - - -	0	6
Other Extras same as above.		

Page Trousers.

Superfine, two pockets, stitched round tops, front of fly and catch - -	5	3
All others made same as above - -	4	3
All Extras as Servants'.		

Machine Work.

Reductions for, and Seams not to be Sewn.
All Extras paid as per Log.

Dress, Frock or Morning Coats. The following seams must not be machined:		
Lapels, side body, side, across waist, shoulder, hind arm of sleeves, and sleeve heads - - - *Less*	1	0
If double stitched edges - - *Less*	2	0
Chesterfields and Pea Coats (Flannel and Serge included). The following seams must not be machined:		
Side seams, hind arm of sleeves, shoulder, or sleeve heads - *Less*	1	0
If double stitched edges - - *Less*	2	0
Covert Coats. Machine may be used on all parts. If strapped or lapped seams and double stitched edges *Less* - - - - - - -	5	0
Ulsters. Machine may be used on all parts - - - - - - *Less*	4	0
Norfolk Jackets. The following seams must not be machined:		
Side seams, hind arms of sleeves, shoulder or sleeve heads - *Less*	2	0
If double stitched - - - *Less*	3	0
Trousers. The leg, side seams, and closing not to be machined, other parts machined - - - *Less*	0	9
Vests. The side or shoulder seams must not be machined.		

19. 6. 30
pmc.

London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine
LIBRARY
19 JUNE 1930

1859